STUDY OF MAKIGUCHI TSUNESABURŌ

The Founder of Sōka Gakkai

A dissertation by

Koichi Mori

presented to

The Faculty of the

Graduate Theological Union

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Theology

Berkeley, California

April, 1977

Committee Signatures:

Coordinator

Robert N. Bellah

James M. Phillips

Benjamin A. Reist

Abstract of STUDY OF MAKIGUCHI TSUNESABURŌ,
the Founder of Sōka Gakkai

by Koichi Mori

This dissertation is a critical study of Makiguchi Tsunesaburō (1871-1944). He was the founder of Sōka Gakkai which is one of new religions in Japan and is the largest religious organization in Japan today.

This dissertation consists of six chapters. The first chapter, "Introduction," introduces the academic context of the studies of Makiguchi. Chapters two to six can be divided into two parts. The first part, chapter two to chapter five, is the chronological study of Makiguchi's thought. Chapter two is a biography of Makiguchi. From chapter three to chapter five, I analyze the characteristics of Makiguchi's thought by following the process of the change in his academic interest, that is, from geography to education, and then to religion.

The second part of this dissertation, chapter six, is my evaluation and critique of Makiguchi's thought. I evaluate Makiguchi highly because he did not despise common people's desire of the improvement of their lives. He pursued the philosophy which could provide the concrete help for the improvement of common people's lives. I cannot find such an element among other philosophers in Japan.

I criticize Makiguchi's thought in the social situation

UMI

of his days, whether or not his thought had the element to transcend the ideology of Emperor system. As the result of my analysis, I conclude that he did not have the philosophical element which could criticize the ideology of Emperor system even though he died in prison by rejecting the worship of the national Shintoism.

In order to find the weakness of Makiguchi's thought, I compare Makiguchi and Yanagita Kunio (1875-1962). Yanagita was a representative folklorist and cultural anthropologist of modern Japan. Yanagita and Makiguchi lived in the same period and had similar scholastic purposes, methodologies, and academic field. As a conclusion, I found that the weakness of Makiguchi's thought is the lack of social-scientific analysis and incompleteness of inductive, positivistic methodology.

UMI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BIOGRAPHY OF MAKIGUCHI	8
III.	MAKIGUCHI'S STUDY OF GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES OF ORIGIN	19
	A. Background	19
	B. Motivation and Purpose	25
	C. Methodology	29
	D. Study of Places of Origin	37
IV.	MAKIGUCHI'S STUDY OF EDUCATION	43
	A. Makiguchi's Criticism of Educational Situation in His Time	44
	B. Makiguchi's Positioning of Pedagogy among Academic Studies	46
	C. Value-creating Pedagogy	48
	(1) "Start from Experiences"	49
	(2) "Set Value as the Goal"	52
	(3) "Make Economy the Principle"	59
	D. Makiguchi's Reformation of Education	60
	E. Philosophy of Value	64
	(1) Revision and Addition by Toda Jōsei	65
	(2) Importance of "Philosophy of Value" in Sōka Gakkai Today	69
	(3) Makiguchi's Philosophy of Value and Its Background	72
V.	MAKIGUCHI'S UNDERSTANDING OF RELIGION	83
	A. Before Conversion	85
	B. Conversion	94
	C. The Teaching of Nichiren	100
	D. Teachings of Nichiren Shōshū	112
	E. Makiguchi's Understanding of Nichiren Shōshū	120

Chapter		Page
VI.	EVALUATION AND CRITIQUE	139
	A. Evaluation of Makiguchi	139
	B. Critique of Makiguchi	143
	(1) Martyrdom	145
	(2) Makiguchi's Understanding of the Ideology of Emperor System . . .	155
	(3) Makiguchi's Understanding of Imperialistic Policies	162
	C. Yanagita Kunio's Thought	166
	(1) Background of Yanagita	166
	(2) Object and Method of Yanagita's Study	171
	(3) Evaluation and Criticism	192
	D. Conclusion: Weakness of Makiguchi's Thought	200
	(1) Lack of Social-scientific Analysis.	202
	(2) Incompleteness of Inductive, Positivistic Methodology	208
APPENDIX	List of Japanese Words	216
BIBLIOGRAPHY		221

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of my dissertation is to evaluate Makiguchi Tsunesaburō's thought. Makiguchi Tsunesaburō (1871-1944) was the founder of Nichiren Shōshū Sōka Gakkai. Nichiren Shōshū is a sect of Buddhism established by Nikkō, a disciple of Nichiren who was one of the thirteenth-century reformers of Buddhism in Japan. Makiguchi interpreted the teachings of Nichiren Shōshū according to his philosophy of value. At first, Sōka Gakkai (Value-creating Academic Society) established with the original name of Sōka Kyōiku Gakkai (Value-creating Educational Society) was an organization aiming for educational reformation. However, along with the change of Makiguchi's thought, it became an organization made up of believers of Nichiren Shōshū.

The central concern throughout this dissertation is what is a thought or a religion that is truly meaningful in a concrete society. I should like to study this question by using Makiguchi as a clue. My interest in Makiguchi centers upon the particularistic element of Sōka Gakkai. Sōka Gakkai is the largest religious organization in Japan today, and the number of its believers has reached almost ten percent of the population.[1]

---

[1] Jiji Nenkan 1976 [Jiji Yearbook, 1976] (Tokyo: Jiji Tsūshin-sha, 1975), p. 249. According to a report given by Sōka Gakkai as of May 1, 1975, 7,650,000 families are members.

Furthermore, the majority of the believers are the common people. Makiguchi's philosophy of value and the philosophy of life of Toda Jōsei, the second president of Sōka Gakkai, are the two main philosophies of Sōka Gakkai. For me Makiguchi's thought, which gave meaning to so many common people in Japan today, is the key to this study.

We can find many sociological, political, historical, psychological, and religious studies concerning Sōka Gakkai. However, most of the studies done by Japanese or foreigners have focused on Sōka Gakkai after the end of World War II. This is because the rapid development of Sōka Gakkai was the result of the movement carried out by Toda Jōsei after the end of World War II. Since Toda specifically emphasized Makiguchi's philosophy of value and neglected his other thought, the study of Makiguchi has focused on his philosophy of value.

There are several studies among Christian circles and Buddhist sects other than Nichiren Shōshū concerned with Makiguchi's philosophy of value. However, most of these are emotional expressions of disapproval, not critical analyses. The following three exceptions are serious studies of his philosophy of value:

Brannen, Noah S. "Sōka Gakkai's Theory of Value." Contemporary Religions in Japan. vol. 5, no.2 (June 1964).

Saki, Akio. "Sōka Gakkai no Kachiron--Hibidarake no Riron-teki Shuchū" (Value Philosophy of Sōka Gakkai--Theoretical Pillar with Cracks). Bunka Hyōron. no. 24 (October 1963).

Umehara, Takeshi. "Sōka Gakkai no Tetsugaku-teki Shūkyō-teki Hihan" (Philosophical and Religious

Criticism of Sōka Gakkai). Shisō no Kagaku (Science of Thought). no. 33 (December 1964).

Brannen's work should be evaluated as one which introduced Makiguchi's philosophy of value simply and clearly in English. Brannen pointed out the contradiction between the mysterious teachings of Nichiren Shōshū and Makiguchi's utilitarianistic philosophy shown in Kachiron (Philosophy of Value). This is Toda's revised edition of Makiguchi's work. This contradiction had already been studied by Oguchi Iichi and Saki Akio; therefore, Brannen's study was not new to Japanese scholars of Sōka Gakkai.[1]

Saki Akio criticized Makiguchi's philosophy of value from a Marxist point of view. He analyzed Makiguchi's thought in the historical context of his age, pointing out that Makiguchi's understanding of value is too subjective and lacks an understanding of political conditions.[2]

Umehara explained the background of Makiguchi's philosophy of value by relating it to the philosophical conditions of Japan in those days. He evaluated Makiguchi's thought highly, and believed that it gave a clear guiding principle to the common people's life which could not be found in other Japanese philosophies. Umehara criticized the Sōka Gakkai's understanding of religion by criticizing Nichiren's thought which Sōka

---

[1]Oguchi Iichi and Saki Akio, Sōka Gakkai (Tokyo: Aoki Shoten, 1957), pp. 103-104.

[2]Saki Akio, "Sōka Gakkai no Kachiron--Hibidarake no Riron-teki Shuchū" [Value Philosophy of Sōka Gakkai--Theoretical Pillar with Cracks], Bunka Hyōron, no. 24 (October 1963), p. 5.

Gakkai depends on. He stated that Buddhism today should not be an exclusive Buddhism like that of Nichiren, but an inclusive, merciful Buddhism. Umehara further pointed out that inclusive, merciful Buddhism can become a new guiding principle of society when it is united with scientific rationality.[1]

A complete study of Makiguchi's life and thought had not been done until Ikeda Satoshi's study in 1969. There are two reasons for this. One is that the people's interest in Sōka Gakkai was directed only to sociological and political studies because of its appearance in politics and the rapid increase of its members in the 1950's and the 1960's. The other reason is that the scholars of thought were not interested in Makiguchi's thought because it was too utilitarianistic and philosophically shallow. At the same time, Makiguchi, unlike Toda Jōsei, did not have a charismatic, passionate personality.

Around 1970 when the rapid increase in membership of Sōka Gakkai leveled off, the study of Makiguchi was begun in Sōka Gakkai. The following three works are representative:

Ikeda, Satoshi. Makiguchi Tsunesaburō. Tokyo: Nihon Sono Shobō, 1969.

Kumagai, Kazunori. Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō (Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Personality and Thought). Tokyo: Daisan Bunmei-sha, 1972.

Misaka, Fusahiro, ed. Makiguchi Tsunesaburō. Tokyo: Seikyō Shinbunsha, 1973.

---

[1]Umehara Takeshi, "Sōka Gakkai no Tetsugaku-teki Shūkyō-teki Hihan" [Philosophical and Religious Criticism of Sōka Gakkai], Shisō no Kagaku, no. 33 (December 1964), p. 95.

These scholars are either members or patronized scholars of Sōka Gakkai. Their works are not critical studies and praise Makiguchi as a heroic figure. Makiguchi the Value Creator, Revolutionary Japanese Educator and Founder of Soka Gakkai, written by Dayle M. Bethel in 1973, is the only book that sees Makiguchi from an uncommitted point of view. However, since Bethel is a scholar of education, the central theme of his work was the study of Makiguchi's ideas about education. In summary, there has been no critical study of Makiguchi's thought as a whole.

Therefore, the first purpose of my dissertation is to clarify Makiguchi's thought as a whole, and this study is, at the same time, a critical study of the understanding of Makiguchi in Sōka Gakkai today. I shall study Makiguchi's thought and his life by analyzing his works chronologically. Makiguchi became a believer of Nichiren Shōshū when he was fifty-seven years old. He published "Kachiron," which is the second volume of Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (Value-creating Educational System), three years after his conversion. I shall study not only Makiguchi's philosophy of value and Makiguchi as a religionist, emphasized by Toda and Sōka Gakkai, but also to analyze the changed and unchanged parts of his thought by following this development from his younger days, pointing out the enduring characteristics of his philosophy.

The second purpose and central concern of my dissertation is to analyze and to evaluate Makiguchi's thought. When I evaluate religious thought and movement, I use "the particu-

laristic and the universal" as the two important elements of the criteria of evaluation. The first element, the particularistic, is the cultural and religious tradition of the believers of the religion. In other words, even though the religion is said to have universal truth, it has no actual value if it is accepted only by intellectuals and/or religious elites. Religion lives in the cultural and religious tradition of a society; and when religion is accepted by the common people of this society, it becomes effective. For me, this society is Japan.

The second element, the universal, is the power of religion which transcends the cultural and religious tradition which is particularistic. If a religion does not have the universal element, it is identical with the cultural and religious tradition of the society. Such a religion can become narrow-minded, believing their society and tradition are the absolute. But when a religion has both elements, the particularistic and the universal, it becomes meaningful to its society.

The age in which Makiguchi lived was the age controlled by the ideology of the Emperor system which is very particularistic. The purpose of my study is to find what meaning and power Makiguchi's thought had for his age and for the present, by analyzing his total outlook.

To clarify this, I shall compare Makiguchi Tsunesaburō and Yanagita Kunio (1875-1962) who lived in the same age. Yanagita was a representative folklorist and cultural anthropologist of modern Japan. Yanagita and Makiguchi lived in the same period and had similar scholastic purposes, methodologies, and

academic fields. They were friends and members of the Society of Places of Origin. However, the final goal which Makiguchi reached formed a remarkable contrast with that of Yanagita. Yanagita did not have any religion of his own even though he made religion the most important theme of his study, while Makiguchi died in prison because of his faith. When we study the reasons for the differences in development of these two men's ideas, we discover the characteristics and weaknesses of Makiguchi's thought.

CHAPTER II

BIOGRAPHY OF MAKIGUCHI

Makiguchi Tsunesaburō was born on June 6, 1871, in a small village, Arahama in Niigata Prefecture in the northwestern part of Japan.[1] His father was Watanabe Chōmatsu and his mother, Ine.

Arahama village is located on sandy land buffeted by rough waves of the Japan Sea, and the name of this village literally means a "desolate shore." Furthermore, for more than six months of the year a strong wind blows every day. Therefore, Arahama Village is adequate neither for farming nor for fishing. In those days many villagers went to Hokkaidō to work. Tsunesaburō's father was one of these, and he went to Hokkaidō when Tsunesaburō was three years old. His father did not return to the village. When Tsunesaburō was six years old, he was adopted by Makiguchi Zendayū, the owner of a small shipping company where his father had worked.

Makiguchi Tsunesaburō was born four years after the Meiji Restoration. The Meiji Restoration was the revolution against the feudal politics of the Tokugawa shogunate. It was not the common people but the samurai (warrior) class that car-

---

[1] Tsunesaburō was not his real name. When he was twenty-two years old, he gave himself this name. His real name was Chōhichi.

ried out this revolution against the Tokugawa shogunate. Therefore, even after the revolution, the people were the target of exploitation by the new officials of the Meiji government. The people in Arahama village were no exception. In 1871 more than 70 thousand people, including those from Arahama, carried out a demonstration in front of the prefectural office to resist the fact that the government forced the people to work unreasonably hard for the levee works of Shinano River. As a result of this demonstration, seven people were punished with death.[1]

After he was adopted, Makiguchi's childhood was not a happy one. His real mother could not forget him so that she often met him secretly. One day she tried to die by drowning with her son in her arms. Some villagers saved them, but thereafter the mother and her son were not allowed to meet each other.[2] His childhood was dreary and not a blessed one.

In 1874 the percentage of school attendance of Arahama Elementary School was 17 percent of children of elementary-school age.[3] Makiguchi was very fortunate to be able to attend elementary school, and he was an excellent student. However, his stepfather was not wealthy enough to send him to a junior high school. After graduation from elementary school, he helped in his stepfather's business for several years.

---

[1]Ikeda Satoshi, Makiguchi Tsunesaburō (Tokyo: Nihon Sono Shobō, 1969), p. 23.

[2]Misaka Fusahiro, ed., Makiguchi Tsunesaburō (Tokyo: Seikyō Shinbun-sha, 1973), p. 20.

[3]Ibid., p. 21.

Subsequently, Makiguchi left his stepfather's home and went to Hokkaidō. The exact year and the reason for this is unknown, but it seems that his stepfather became too poor to support him. Ikeda Satoshi thinks that Makiguchi was around the age of fifteen or sixteen, while Sōka Gakkai thinks that he was fourteen.[1] Makiguchi went to his uncle's house in Hokkaidō, and through his uncle he found work at Otaru Police Office. His job was to run errands, serve tea, and clean the building. The marshal of Otaru Police Office evaluated Makiguchi highly so that he took Makiguchi with him when he was transferred to a police office in Sapporo.

About this time, Makiguchi entered Hokkaidō Normal School. The exact year of his entrance is unknown. According to his own personal history (this personal history was found by Kamio Takeo), he states that he entered in 1889 and graduated in 1893.[2] However, Sōka Gakkai states that Makiguchi enrolled in the third year in 1891 and graduated in 1893.[3] There can be two causes for this contradiction: One is Makiguchi's lack of memory, and the other is possible revision of Makiguchi's personal history by Sōka Gakkai. The motivation for the latter might be to make it look as though Makiguchi was so brilliant that he finished four years of college in two years.

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 26-27; and Ikeda, Makiguchi, p. 28.

[2]Kamio Takeo, "Sōka Kyōiku Gakusetsu Seiritsu no Katei" [The Composing Process of Value-creating Educational Theory], Tōyō Gakujutsu Kenkyū, vol. 5, no. 8 (November 1966), p. 7.

[3]Kodaira Yoshihei, Sōka Gakkai (Tokyo: Ōtori Shoin, 1963), p. 64; and Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 28.

The period when Makiguchi studied at Hokkaidō Normal School was the time that the educational system of modern Japan was changed greatly. In 1890 the Civil Law was promulgated. This law established the extended family system based on Confucian ideas with the head of a family as its center. In the same year, the Imperial Rescript on Education was proclaimed. This Imperial Rescript on Education aimed at establishing "the nation as a family" with the Emperor as its center, and it became the leading ideology of education in Japan until the end of World War II. Centralizing control of textbooks by the government was made into law in 1892. In this way, the Meiji government tried to perpetuate the ideology of the Emperor system among the people of the nation by education and thus unify the people.

Because of its role, Hokkaidō Normal School, where Makiguchi studied, was greatly influenced by the educational policy of the Meiji government. In those days, all the students of normal schools had to live in dormitories. Students were under very strict rules and supervision from the hour of rising to bedtime. There was no difference between education at normal schools and that of military troops. Students were not allowed to read newspapers.[1]

It is not clear how Makiguchi felt about the education of Hokkaidō Normal School based on the ideology of Emperor system. Compared to his earlier life, Makiguchi's life at the

---

[1]Ikeda, Makiguchi, pp. 33-34.

normal school was financially easy. Tuition and living expenses were all free. Moreover, students were given free textbooks, school supplies, clothes, and even the money for returning home during the vacation. Before graduation, he passed the examination to obtain a high-school teacher's license in geography and pedagogy.

After graduating from Hokkaidō Normal School, Makiguchi became a teacher at the elementary school affiliated with Hokkaidō Normal School. The main theme of his study in those days was how to teach efficiently in a one-room school. In Hokkaidō where the population was sparse, it was impossible to have various classes according to the age of the pupils, so one teacher taught all grades. It was in 1892 that the elementary school where Makiguchi worked first established a one-room system for the study of one-room education, and Makiguchi, the new teacher, was in charge of this project. Yamasaki Chōkichi, compiler of Hokkaidō Kyōiku-shi (the History of Education in Hokkaidō), said that one-room education was actually started by Makiguchi.[1] While he was teaching at the elementary school, he also became an assistant teacher of Hokkaidō Normal School in 1897 and a teacher in 1900. During this period, he published many articles on pedagogy in educational magazines.

In 1895 when Makiguchi was twenty-four years old, he married Makiguchi Kuma. In 1901, he resigned his job as a teacher at the Normal School and the elementary school and went

---

[1]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 36.

to Tokyo. The reason for his resignation was that he, as the dormitory inspector of the Normal School, was made to take the blame for violent actions in the strikes carried out by the students in the dormitory.[1] The apparent reason was this incident, but there also seemed to be another reason. This was his desire to become a geographer.

He left Hokkaidō together with his wife and his two children. At that time, he had the draft of his first work, Jinsei Chirigaku (Human-life Geography), in his suitcase. After he went to Tokyo, he visited Tsuboi Kumazō, a historian, and Shiga Shigetake, a geographer, to show the draft of his work. It seems that Makiguchi tried to obtain a job as a geographer by publishing Jinsei Chirigaku. It was in 1903 that this book was published with the help of Shiga Shigetaka. This book went through three editions in the first year of publication, and it went through ten editions up to 1909.[2]

In spite of the good reputation of Jinsei Chirigaku, his desire to obtain a job as a geographer was not realized. In those days, it was regarded that normal school was an educational institution which is one-level lower than a university. What destroyed Makiguchi's desire to be successful as a geographer were the evils of the academic world of Japan. Makiguchi had a very difficult time economically from 1901 to 1903. In 1902, his second son was born, and the five members of his family

---

[1]Ikeda, Makiguchi, pp. 44-45.

[2]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 502.

lived in one rented room. In 1905, out of necessity, he began doing jobs other than geographer in order to obtain an economically stable life. The jobs which he accepted were secretary of the alumni association of Tokyo Normal School, editor of educational magazines, teacher of correspondence lessons, and so forth. However, his life became more difficult than before because he had three more children during this period.

In order to overcome such difficulties caused by having no permanent job, Makiguchi became vice-principal of an elementary school in Tokyo in 1909. Makiguchi, who left Hokkaidō and came to Tokyo with one hope, failed after nine years of struggle. This nine-year experience of suffering appeared later in Makiguchi in two contradictory forms: One is his strong admiration of the authorities in the academic world, and the other, his strong resistance against the existing studies.[1]

In 1910 he had to resign from the teaching job at the elementary school due to sickness, and he started to compile geography textbooks in the Ministry of Education. It was at this time that Makiguchi met Nitobe Inazō and Yanagita Kunio. Nitobe was a scholar of agricultural administration and was interested in the study of the places of origin as his clue to understand farm villages and farmers. Makiguchi met Yanagita

---

[1]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)" [Human-life Geography], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū [Collection of Makiguchi Tsunesaburō's Works], ed. Daisaku Ikeda (Tokyo: Tōzai Tetsugaku Shoin, 1965), vol. 4, p. 278; and Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Kōzui Jūōdan to Kyōiku Shūkyō Kakumei" [Ōtani Kōzui's Essay and Educational, Religious Revolution], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, p. 500.

in 1909 through the introduction of a critic. Yanagita was a government official in the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce and studied folklore and life of Japanese people in various areas. In 1910 Makiguchi became a member of the Academic Society of Places of Origin (Kyōdokai) established by Nitobe and Yanagita. In 1912 Makiguchi published his second book, Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin to shite no Kyōdoka Kenkyū (Study of Places of Origin as the Core of All Lessons).

In 1913 Makiguchi became the principal of an elementary school in Tokyo. He worked as principal of six elementary schools in Tokyo over a period of nineteen years until he resigned his job in 1932. During this period, he kept his interest in the study of geography and that of places of origin, but he gradually withdrew from the Academic Society of Places of Origin because of the demands of his job as a principal and because of his study of pedagogy.[1] As a principal, Makiguchi spent all his energies in studying the most effective pedagogy and the most efficient school management. Makiguchi was a person who carried through his belief concerning education and school management without compromising his position. Therefore, he often had to change schools because of confrontation with powerful members of the community.

It was in 1930 that Makiguchi published his main work,

---

[1]Yanagita Kunio, "Jo" [Introduction to Makiguchi's Value-creating Educational System], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 1, pp. 399-400; and Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin to shite no Kyōdoka Kenkyū" [Study of Places of Origin as the Core of All Lessons], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, pp. 408-409.

Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (the Value-creating Educational System). In this book he wrote the theory of education based on his experiences as a teacher over thirty years. The publisher of this book was Sōka Kyōiku Gakkai (Value-creating Educational Society). The Value-creating Educational Society was the organization established by Makiguchi and Toda Jōsei (a disciple of Makiguchi) for the purpose of the study of pedagogy, and it is the origin of the present Sōka Gakkai. Sōka Gakkai places November 18, 1930, the publication date of Makiguchi's Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei, as the date of its establishment.

Sōka Gakkai is a lay organization of believers of Nichiren Shōshū, a Buddhist sect which worships Nichiren who was a Buddhist religious reformer in the thirteenth century. Makiguchi came to believe in Nichiren Shōshū in 1928 when he was fifty-seven years old. Since his approach to religion and the change of his thought are the important parts of my dissertation, they will be discussed in later chapters. The more Makiguchi became involved in religion, the more changed became the character of the Value-creating Educational Society. In other words, at first, the Value-creating Educational Society was the organization established by teachers for the purpose of educational reform, but after 1940 it gradually changed into a religious organization based on the doctrine of Nichiren Shōshū and Makiguchi's thought.[1] This was the time when World War II broke out in Europe and when Japan was in a dismal period

---

[1]Murakami Shigeyoshi, Sōka Gakkai: Komeitō [Sōka Gakkai: Clean Government Party] (Tokyo: Aoki Shoten, 1967), p. 91.

marching toward World War II two years later.

At that time, Makiguchi was absorbed in religious movement, the movement to improve the way of living of the people by faith in Nichiren Shōshū and his own philosophy of value. The form of his movement was discussion meetings, consisting of a small number of people. In 1941, the organ of Kachi Sōzō (Value-creation) was first issued, but it was discontinued the next year by order of the Bureau of Public Order.

In order to win in World War II, the government tried to unify and control all the people ideologically. To do that, the government pursued totalitarian policies in every field of peoples' lives. The government enacted the law on religious organizations in 1941 and unified divergent groups so that it could easily control religious organizations.[1] The government ordered Nichiren Shōshū to unite with Nichiren-shū, but Makiguchi and other members of the Value-creating Educational Society rejected this order. Nichiren Shōshū, afraid of further government oppression because of the Society's rejection of this order, prohibited the members of the Society from worshipping at the Taisekiji Temple, head temple of Nichiren Shōshū.[2] Makiguchi was arrested together with other leaders of the Value-creating Educational Society in 1943. The reason for this arrest was violation of the Maintenance of the Public Order Act;

---

[1]Akashi Hirotaka and Matsuura Sōzō, Shōwa Tokkō Dan'atsu-shi [History of Oppression by the Special Secret Service Police during the Shōwa Era], vol. 4 (Tokyo: Taihei Shuppan-sha, 1975), pp. 315-320.

[2]Ikeda, Makiguchi, p. 179.

specifically, it was disloyal to the Emperor and refusal to worship at the Ise, the Imperial shrine.[1] On November 18, 1944, after one year and four months in prison, Makiguchi died from old age and malnutrition in prison in Tokyo. He was seventy-three years old.

---

[1]Akashi and Matsuura, Shōwa Tokkō Dan'atsu-shi, vol. 4, p. 154.

CHAPTER III

MAKIGUCHI'S STUDY OF GEOGRAPHY AND PLACES OF ORIGIN

A. Background

Geography was the main interest of Makiguchi while he was studying at Hokkaidō Normal School from 1889 to 1893. The study of world geography was a very new field since it was only a few decades after the Meiji government opened the country to foreign intercourse. After graduation, Makiguchi became a teacher of the elementary school affiliated with Hokkaidō Normal School and studied school education in remote rural areas while he became a teacher of geography at Hokkaidō Normal School. In this way, Makiguchi started his academic study of geography.

In his study of geography, Makiguchi was influenced by Shiga Shigetaka, Uchimura Kanzō, and Nitobe Inazō. Later Uchimura was to become the founder of the Non-Church (Mukyōkai) in Japan, and Nitobe also became a representative Christian in Japan. Uchimura and Nitobe entered Sapporo Agricultural School in 1877, and two years later Shiga entered the same school. It is interesting to note that these three leading scholars of anthropogeography in Meiji Era were graduates of Sapporo Agricultural School. Makiguchi said in Jinsei Chirigaku that he became interested in geography because of Shiga's works. Here,

he did not point out the names of Uchimura and Nitobe because this work was published with Shiga's help and with his commentary.[1] Shiga's Nihon Fūkei-ron (Study of Japan's Landscapes) and Uchimura's Chirigaku-kō (About Geography), later on this title was changed to Chijin-ron (Study of Land and Man), were published in 1894. Sapporo Agricultural School and Hokkaidō Normal School were built adjoining each other and there were many occasions of exchange between the two schools. Therefore, Makiguchi must have had great interest in the works of these two graduates of Sapporo Agricultural School. From Nitobe Makiguchi learned many things about studies of geography written in foreign languages.[2] Makiguchi was attracted especially by Karl Ritter (1779-1859), the founder of anthropogeography.

> According to Karl Ritter, the study of the earth alone is not enough for the study of geography; the most important thing for geography is the relationship and the mutual influence between geographical features and human beings. Karl Ritter brought a new aspect to the development of geography, which, as some people say, brightens the future of geography.[3]

The fundamental viewpoint which is common among Uchimura, Shiga, and Ritter was that there is a correlation between land and man.[4]

---

[1]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Jinsei Chirigaku (1)," in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 3, p. 4.

[2]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 186.

[3]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 547.

[4]Ayuzawa Masaharu, Jinmon Chirigaku Josetsu [Introduction to Human Geography] (Tokyo: Sekai Shoin, 1949), pp. 154-155.

> The same geographical situation, wherever it may be, will create the same kind of man.[1]
>
> The history of a country is the result of an interaction between the land and the people.[2]

Such a viewpoint is not new today when anthropogeography and anthropology are popular, but it was very new in those days, so that it naturally attracted Makiguchi who started the study of geography. In those days, geography was included among the subjects of elementary and junior high schools, but it was not studied professionally in universities. Kyoto Imperial University was the first university in Japan that provided a course in geography; that was in 1908.[3]

Makiguchi made two classifications for the study of geography or the study of the earth: geography and geology. Furthermore, he classified geography into two smaller fields: natural geography or physical geography and anthropogeography or human-life geography. In natural geography, the subject is the influence of land on the natural world, while in anthropogeography, the subject is the influence of geographical conditions on the life of human beings.[4] He defined his study of

---

[1]Shiga Shigetake, "Nihon Fūkei-ron" [Study of Japan's Landscapes], in Shiga Shigetaka Zenshū [Collection of the Works of Shiga Shigetaka], ed. Shiga Fujio (Tokyo: Shiga Shigetaka Zenshū Kankō Kai, 1928), vol. 4, p. 151.

[2]Uchimura Kanzō, "Chijin-ron" [Study of Land and Man], in Uchimura Kanzō Shinkō Chosaku-shu [Collection of the Writings of Uchimura Kanzō on Faith], ed. Yamamoto Taijirō (Tokyo: Kyōbunkan, 1963), vol. 4, p. 16.

[3]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 179.

[4]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 552.

geography as follows:

> Anthropogeography is a systematic knowledge of the relation between the natural phenomena of the earth and the phenomena of human life.[1]

In this definition some characteristics which later became the core of his thought are already appearing. The first characteristic is to center the human life; the second is to value highly the problems of relation; and the third is to aim at systematization.

Ogawa Takuji, a geographer, criticized the name that Makiguchi gave to his study, human-life geography. Ogawa said that Makiguchi's viewpoint of geography is the same as that of Friedrich Ratzel and that Ratzel called his geography Anthropogeographie or Kulturgeographie, while Makiguchi changed it to "human-life geography."[2] In response Makiguchi explained that Ratzel's term, Anthropogeographie, is liable to be mixed up with anthropology and that Kulturgeographie covers too wide a meaning and is ambiguous.[3] What Makiguchi tried to study through geography was not an ambiguous subject like culture, but it was a more concrete subject, human life. Moreover, he was not satisfied with the limit of anthropology which keeps a record of human life. His intention was to find the universal law between geography and human life and to systematize this universal law.

The characteristic of Makiguchi's study of geography is

---

[1]Ibid., p. 545.

[2]Ibid., pp. 616-617.

[3]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (1)," p. 2.

that he studied this subject with a clear intention, not simply from a scholastic interest. This characteristic is found not only in Makiguchi but also in those who studied geography in the same period. Their common question was what kind of path Japan and the Japanese people should take after the Meiji Restoration. Furthermore, Japan inevitably had to confront the developed, imperialistic nations of Europe and the United States in its course of modernization. The year 1894, when Shiga's Nihon Fūkei-ron and Uchimura's Chijin-ron were published, was time when the Sino-Japanese War broke out. The year 1903 when Makiguchi's Jinsei Chirigaku was published was one year before the Russo-Japanese War.

Shiga, especially, had a fear of the invasion of Japan by the imperialistic nations. In 1886 he went to Australia, New Zealand, and other South Sea Islands with the navy's inspection voyage. In 1887 he published a book on this travel, Nanyō Jiji (Current Situation of the South Sea), in which he reported the invasion of the South Sea Islands by the Anglo-Saxons and predicted this as Japan's future destiny.[1] With a sense of crisis Shiga was motivated to write Nihon Fūkeiron to keep Japan independent. He had a nationalistic intention. His response was to study the characteristics of Japan's geography, landscapes, and people, to help the people understand what he had

---

[1]Suzuki Norihisa, Uchimura Kanzō to Sono Jidai, Shiga Shigetaka tono Hikaku [Uchimura Kanzō and His Age, in Comparison with Shiga Shigetaka] (Tokyo: Nihon Kirisutokyō-dan Shuppan-kyoku, 1975), pp. 108-111.

learned, and to motivate them to patriotism.[1]

Uchimura's viewpoint was not purely a nationalistic one like Shiga's. The poem which Uchimura himself chose to inscribe on his grave stone shows this most clearly.

> I for Japan
> Japan for the World
> The World for Christ
> And all for God.[2]

Uchimura was a patriot. However, his patriotic spirit had the Christian faith as its universal foundation. The purpose of his study of geography was to know the characteristics of Japan and the Japanese people and to discover the natural and original way for the people of Japan to contribute to the world and to God. He often conflicted with the missionaries who tried to spread among the people European/American-culture oriented Christianity.

> Those who do not study geography try to import Puritanism, which was developed in England covered with smog and fog, as it is into our country where the mountains and the sea are beautiful and cherry blossoms give a nice fragrance.[3]

In this statement we can find Uchimura's clear intention that geography and people are correlative to each other and that the mission of Christianity should be done relative to the geography and culture of the people in that setting. Uchimura did not have the fear of Europe and the United States that Shiga did. Uchimura accepted the nations of Europe and the United States as Christian nations, and it seems that he subconsciously trusted

---

[1]Shiga, "Nihon Fūkei-ron," pp. 173-174.

[2]Suzuki, Uchimura Kanzō, p. 248.

[3]Uchimura, "Chijin-ron," p. 12.

the people of those nations. Later on, however, Uchimura's trust of these nations was destroyed by the fact that even Christian churches and ministers in Christian nations agreed to and supported World War I. After that, he sank into despair about the world, and he changed to radical, escatological faith.[1] However, when he wrote Chijin-ron, he still believed in the evolutional development of history and did not have any fear or despair about Western countries. By studying geography, Uchimura regarded the mission of Japan as follows:

> Japan is an island country. An island country always has the function to help relations between continents. I have already written that England, located between Europe and the United States, developed the United States by using the civilization of Europe and brought the wealth of the United States to Europe. . . . Japan is located between the United States and the Asian continent. Japan's mission is to help develop close contact across the Pacific Ocean.[2]

In other words, Uchimura thought that Japan should play the role of intermediary between the East and the West.[3]

B. Motivation and Purpose

Makiguchi's geography was influenced by Shiga's geography with a nationalistic aspect and by Uchimura's geography with a balance of international and national aspects based on Christianity. Then, what kind of motivation and purpose did Makiguchi have in his study of geography?

Kumagai Ichijō said that Makiguchi combined and devel-

---

[1]Suzuki, Uchimura Kanzō, p. 229.

[2]Uchimura, "Chijin-ron," p. 91.

[3]Ibid., p. 92.

oped the geography of Uchimura and Shiga, but he did not explain how and at what point Makiguchi combined them.[1] I think Makiguchi's motivation was different from that of Uchimura or that of Shiga. Makiguchi's interest was neither Shiga's idea of self-awareness of the Japanese people nor Uchimura's idea of indigenous Christianity. Instead, Makiguchi's main interest was the concrete life of an individual, living in the particular nation of Japan. In other words, Makiguchi's prime motivation was to study how well people can deal with their daily lives. In this respect, Makiguchi's standpoint was closer to the feeling of the common people than that of Uchimura or Shiga. Makiguchi stated the purpose of his study of geography as follows:

> (1) The study of geography is made possible by things closely related to our daily life. Therefore, by this study people can know the reality of actual societies and obtain the necessary knowledge for living.
> (2) People can develop common sense which is necessary when judging problems of daily life.[2]

Makiguchi did not have an universal thought as Uchimura did. In this respect Makiguchi is closer to Shiga than Uchimura. Makiguchi continued to state the purpose of his study of geography as follows:

> (3) By understanding real society, people can get knowledge about the world, realize the right position of their own country in the world, their own village in their country, and themselves individually in their own village,

---

[1]Kumagai Kazunori, Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō [Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Personality and Thought] (Tokyo: Daisan Bunmei-sha, 1972), p. 49.

[2]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 613.

and develop a fair, stable patriotic spirit and a sense of love toward their society.[1]

The second motivation for Makiguchi was to search for the future path of the newly-born Japan and its people, which was the same as the motivation of Shiga and Uchimura. However, we should remember that in Makiguchi's case the second motivation was not more important than the first one. Makiguchi thought that the study of geography is the practical answer to the problems of Japan and the Japanese people today and in the future. There are two aspects to this. One is that the study of geography is a clue for the Japanese people to reform themselves; the other is that the study of geography provides knowledge about the wealth and armament of a country (fukoku kyōhei) which is necessary for the Japanese people in order to protect their own independence from the invasion of imperialistic nations of Europe and of the United States. It seems that Makiguchi accepted the first aspect from Uchimura and the second one from Shiga.

As stated before, Uchimura regarded the mission of the Japanese people to be an intermediary between the East and the West. The geographical condition for this idea is that Japan is an island country. An island nation can become either negative or positive depending on their geographical condition. Makiguchi expressed this negative, closed character as "people of an insular country" and the positive character as "people of an ocean country." Makiguchi thought that the negative aspect

---

[1]Ibid.

of "people of an insular country" would become the biggest obstacle for the future development of Japan. He stated this thought again and again in Jinsei Chirigaku.[1] He thought that it is the responsibility of Japanese scholars of geography to change the Japanese people from the "people of an insular country" to the "people of an ocean country."[2]

When Makiguchi evaluated positively the geographical condition of Japan surrounded by the ocean, what he meant was different from Uchimura's thought of mission for Japanese people. Makiguchi was not an idealistic internationalist like Uchimura, but he was a realist. Makiguchi, like Shiga, had a great fear of the imperialist nations of Europe and of the United States.

> The final goal of a nation is humanism which is the final goal of a human life. But in order to reach this final goal, we have to go through several steps. The present time is one of the steps, the imperialist age. There are many more miles left to go until the people reach their ideal society by cooperating with one another. Under the present situation while the imperialist nations are trying to invade other nations, Japan should, before anything else, do its best to develop the policy of wealth and armament of the nation in order to protect itself from being destroyed by the imperialist nations, and in order to realize the ideal world.[3]

In Jinsei Chirigaku Makiguchi often stated the relationship between geography and the defense of the nation.[4] However, Makiguchi's thought of the Japanese people to become the people

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (1)," pp. 77-80, pp. 257-271.

[2]Ibid., p. 270.

[3]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 407.

[4]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (1)," pp. 86-87, p. 315, p. 375.

of an ocean country resulted in supporting the invasion of imperialist nations. I shall criticize this point later on in this dissertation.

C. Methodology

What was Makiguchi's methodology when he studied geography with such motivations? I will classify the characteristics of his methodology into three aspects: The first aspect is whether or not the study of geography can provide interest to the daily life of the people. In other words, it is to evaluate and to study the geographical phenomena in relation to the people's life. This aspect is related to the first motivation of his study stated earlier. The second aspect is to value the direct observation of an individual phenomenon. This viewpoint values positivism. The third aspect is not only to value the observation of an individual phenomenon but also to discover and to systematize the universal law.

The object of his study was the real society in which the people are actually living.[1] Makiguchi stated that the most important part in his Jinsei Chirigaku is the chapter about the "phenomenon of human life on the earth as the stage" which deals with society, nation, division of labor, industry, city and village, social custom, and so forth.[2] In this respect, we can say that Makiguchi's study of geography was sociology. For Makiguchi, the study of geography was a study for practical use.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 4.

[2] Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 3.

He explained the relations between man and land by dividing them into eight aspects: (1) perceptive, (2) beneficial, (3) scientific, (4) aesthetic, (5) moralistic, (6) sympathetic, (7) public, and (8) religious. Among these eight aspects, Makiguchi thought the second aspect, beneficial, most important.[1] His criticism was that the study of geography in the past was not for practical use.[2] As early as Jinsei Chirigaku we can find fragments of his thought which he organized as the philosophy of value later on. In other words, when he evaluated something as having value, it should bring benefit to people's lives and should have practical use.[3]

This viewpoint of Makiguchi's is pragmatism. Tsurumi Shunsuke was the first scholar who related Makiguchi to pragmatism. Tsurumi found in Makiguchi the influence of William James' pragmatism which can be commonly found in the philosophical context of the beginning of the Taisho Era (1912-1926).[4] Dayle M. Bethel regarded Makiguchi's thought as the indigenous expression of pragmatism to Japan.[5] There is no doubt about the fact that Makiguchi's thought is pragmatistic as these two scholars pointed

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (1)," pp. 23-24.

[2]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 599, p. 613.

[3]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (1)," p. 155, p. 271.

[4]Tsurumi Shunsuke, Mori Hideto, Yanagita Kunio, and Shimane Kiyoshi, Shakubuku [Forced Conversion] (Tokyo: Sanpō, 1963), p. 257.

[5]Dayle M. Bethel, Makiguchi the Value Creator, Revolutionary Japanese Educator and Founder of Sōka Gakkai (New York and Tokyo: Weatherhill, 1973), p. 81.

out. However, I do not think that Makiguchi's pragmatistic thought was formed by the influence of William James or John Dewey. But I think that Makiguchi found the commonness in their thought. Bethel explained that Makiguchi learned the thought of foreign nations through translated works because he did not know any foreign languages; also that for thirty years after 1888 pragmatism became very popular among the educationalists and philosophers in Japan, and that during this period several works of Dewey's were translated into Japanese. From this explanation, Bethel pointed out that American pragmatism influenced greatly the formation of Makiguchi's thought.[1] However, pragmatistic thought was discovered not only by James and Dewey. The pragmatism which we find in Makiguchi was the tradition of the Japanese common people's thought to protect their lives before anything else. For example, the common people only superficially showed their attitude of obedience to political power. However, they protected the welfare of their lives as the most important thing without being controlled by the logic of the political authority or without accepting the logic of intellectual people.[2] Makiguchi did not accept the thought of James and Dewey positively. He rather discovered the commonness with his thought in the American pragmatistic thought.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 82.

[2]The following book is a good reference for this idea of Japanese common people in Tokugawa Era: Fukawa Kiyoshi, Kinsei Nihon no Minshū Rinri Shisō [Ethical Thought of Common People in Tokugawa Period] (Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1973).

> The thought of pragmatistic education recently propagandized as a new theory is almost identical with my thought to value the study of places of origin and to value the application of the study in the people's daily life.[1]

The second characteristic of Makiguchi's methodology is to value the individualistic. Nine years after the publication of his first work, Jinsei Chirigaku, he published his second work, Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin to shite no Kyōdoka Kenkyū. In the introduction to this work, Makiguchi states that this work, as well as Jinsei Chirigaku, was written from the same viewpoint which is to value the direct observation of the familiar phenomenon in the places of origin.[2] Makiguchi valued the observation of the familiar phenomenon in the people's places of origin because he had one premise or one conviction. This was to reach the universal theory through the familiar phenomena which are very particularistic.

> It is not a difficult thing to explain the epitome of the complicated phenomenon of world geography from the obervation of one small village. . . . This is the reason why I carry out the precise observation of the places of origin as the first step and then induce from this observation the truth which can be applied to general geographical phenomenon.[3]

Since the study of geography for Makiguchi was a study for practical use in the people's daily life, the above-stated premise of Makiguchi meant that for the people the principle, to be able to live happily in this world, can be obtained through the observation of the places of origin.

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Kyōju no Tōgō Chūsin," p. 72.

[2]Ibid., p. 3.

[3]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (1)," p. 15.

> We should realize that we are living in this world. But before that, we should realize that we are living in our own country. Furthermore, before this, we should realize that we are living in our own place of origin. . . . We should know this order and carry out the observation of the places of origin. This is vitally necessary when we understand the world fairly and realize the foundation of an individual's life correctly.[1]

This position of Makiguchi came from his attitude of valuing scientific methods. The object of his study of geography or that of education was human beings, but he rejected attempts to start the study from a philosophical premise or an abstract, philosophical definition of the essence.[2] What he valued most highly were the direct observations of familiar phenomenon and actual proof of repeated observations. One of his students at Hokkaidō Normal School said that Makiguchi emphasized the necessity of keeping the record of the climate, customs, and the feelings of the places of origin as they are without scholars' feelings.[3] Makiguchi's direct observation, high evaluation of experiences, and positivistic attitude were what he consistently wanted to have in his study of geography, education, and religion.

The observation of the phenomenon was not Makiguchi's final goal. His final purpose was to obtain a certain principle based on the observations and experiences by deducing from them. This is the third characteristic of his methodology. This char-

---

[1]Ibid., p. 7.

[2]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai" [A Summary of the Value-creating Educational System], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, pp. 440-441.

[3]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 58.

acteristic distinguishes his study of geography from the study of anthropology and folklore. In other words, in anthropology or the study of folklore, the purpose and the methodology are to observe and describe the lives of the people in detail, while Makiguchi's purpose was to discover the universal rule which is working in the people's life. He called his methodology, starting from the observation of facts, as an inductive method.[1] But at the same time, he accepted the aspect of deductive method. In other words, he had the purpose of study to discover a rule by comparative study of the results of the observation of the facts. An inductive method and a deductive method do not contradict each other. Especially in social science, these two methods are mutually dependent. The difference of the scholars' methodology is decided by which of the two and by how much they are emphasized in their study. In Makiguchi's case, I think he emphasized the deductive method more strongly than the inductive method. Makiguchi classified the method of the study of geography into three parts, (a) descriptive method, (b) comparative method, and (c) unified method, and thought that the method of the study of geography was developed in this order.[2] To Makiguchi even though the descriptive method was the source of the study of geography, it is something like a record of travel and as long as the study of geography remains in this stage, there is no development. For Makiguchi, it was natural for man

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 602.

[2]Ibid., pp. 604-605.

to desire the unification of fragmented knowledge.

> The more the transportation system develops, or the more abundant the fragmented knowledge of various areas becomes, the stronger becomes man's desire to compare the knowledge, to study its difference, and to typify it.[1]

Makiguchi's strong desire to find a general rule was probably influenced by Shiga's methodology of the study of geography. Makiguchi stated the premise of his study of geography in the same way as that of Shiga:

> The same kind of land gives the same kind of influence to the people of the same class and makes them live the same kind of life even though the actual locations are different. . . . As plants have their growing district, the social phenomena have their geographical area.[2]

With such a premise Makiguchi boldly made a geographical, sociological generalization. Now, I should like to introduce some of the examples from Jinsei Chirigaku.

This work, Jinsei Chirigaku, consists of four parts. The title of the first part is "Land as the Place for Human Life," which is divided into thirteen chapters: (1) the sun and the stars, (2) the earth, (3) island, (4) peninsula, (5) isthmus, (6) mountain and valley, (7) plain, (8) river, (9) lake and swamp, (10) ocean, (11) inland sea and strait, (12) port, and (13) beach. In this part, Makiguchi dealt with these geographical phenomena and explained about their formation and characteristics from the geographical and natural-scientific standpoint. Then he stated how these geographical phenomena influence the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 604.

[2] Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (1)," p. 32. See Shiga, "Nihon Fūkei-ron," p. 151.

life and the feelings of the people who are living in these geographical phenomena. Here, his bold generalization is done. The following quotations are examples of this.

> Nationalistic characteristics are preserved in mountains. Nationalistic characteristics are conservativeness and inflexible feeling. Mountains are the castle of the nature and make narrow the feelings of the people living in mountains. They envy and exclude others and fight among themselves. The fights in feudal ages were greatly influenced by mountains.[1]

> The plain is the most convenient land for transportation and the busiest land in the sense of movement of people and goods. Therefore, people do not live in isolation, and the prices of goods are balanced. While the people in mountain areas have an isolated tendency, the people in plains have a cooperative, depending tendency.[2]

> The people in the United States are broad-minded and ambitious because they are living in the plains. Russians also have the characteristic of the people living in the plains.[3]

The second part of Jinsei Chirigaku is titled "Correlation between Man and Nature on the Land" and consists of six chapters: (1) inanimate being, (2) atmosphere, (3) climate, (4) plants, (5) animals, and (6) human beings. In this part even though Makiguchi wrote about the relation between nature and man, he did not have any consciousness of ecology of today. His point of study is how such natural phenomena influence the economic life and the feelings of the people. His generalization can also be found in this part. He classified the people of the world into four stages: (1) barbarous, (2) uncivilized,

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (1)," pp. 152-153.

[2]Ibid., p. 164.

[3]Ibid., p. 168.

(3) semi-civilized, and (4) civilized. He found the cause for the difference of such intellectual development in geographical phenomena only, which is too bold a generalization.[1]

The third part of Jinsei Chirigaku is about the "Phenomena of Human Life on the Earth as the Stage." This is divided into seven chapters: (1) division of labor and land, (2) industry and land, (3) nation and land, (4) city or village and land, (5) customs and manners and land, (6) struggle for existence and land, and (7) civilization and land. The contents of this part are politics, economy, urban problems, and culture so that this part is rather a sociological field.

The fourth part is "General Remarks on the Study of Geography." Here, he wrote about the relation to and comparison between his Jinsei Chirigaku and other geography.

D. Study of Places of Origin

Makiguchi's Jinsei Chirigaku went through ten editions in six years after its first publication, but it was neglected by the academic society of geography. However, a few scholars accepted his work highly. One such scholar was Nitobe Inazō. Nitobe was a scholar of agricultural policy. When Nitobe was an engineer at the government-general headquarters of Taiwan, a Japanese colony at that time, he read Makiguchi's Jinsei Chirigaku and sent him a letter of high evaluation of his work.[2]

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," pp. 215-216, pp. 265-266.

[2]Makiguchi, "Kyōju no Tōgō Chūsin," p. 412.

Nitobe thought that it was necessary to understand correctly the reality of farm villages and fishing villages in order to carry out the agricultural policy. He established Kyōdokai (the Society of Places of Origin) which was an academic group to study about local areas. Makiguchi was a member of the Society of Places of Origin from the beginning of its establishment. One of its leading members was Yanagita Kunio. Yanagita was a government official of agricultural policy like Nitobe, and he also realized the necessity of the study of local areas. After Nitobe left for Geneva for work at the League of Nations, Yanagita became the central figure of the study of places of origin in Japan. Yanagita gradually developed his study from the study of places of origin for agricultural policy to the essential study of places of origin, the study of folklore. Later on, he created a new study field called the study of folklore of Japan (Nihon minzoku-gaku).

Makiguchi met Yanagita for the first time in 1909. At that time, Makiguchi was unhappy because in spite of his publication of Jinsei Chirigaku, no university invited him as a scholar of geography. Against his will Makiguchi became an elementary school teacher again in 1909 to earn a living. At that time Yanagita was thirty-five years old, three years younger than Makiguchi. After graduating from Tokyo Imperial University, Yanagita became the government official of the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce, the Ministry of Justice, and then the Ministry of Imperial Household. In this way, he lived his life as an elite. In 1910, one year after Makiguchi met

Yanagita, Yanagita published Tōno Monogatari (the Legends of Tōno) which became the first step in the study of folklore in Japan.[1] Yanagita was a person who had everything that Makiguchi wanted to have but could not have. In 1911 Yanagita and Makiguchi made a research together in the present Yamanashi Prefecture. Yanagita stated about this research as follows:

> In May 1911 I invited Mr. Makiguchi and went to Yamanashi Prefecture together. . . . It was such a remote area that it took three days to send a telegram. My purpose of this trip was to study and teach the research method of farm villages by observing the mountain villages. It was such a refreshing, impressive trip that I still remember the landscapes clearly.[2]

As is clear from the above quotation, Yanagita was going to teach Makiguchi, which shows clearly the relationship between Yanagita and Makiguchi as a teacher and a student rather than as friends.

Originally the Society of Places of Origin was organized by a group of people who were personally acquainted with Nitobe and Yanagita; however, the object of their study and the methodology were varied.[3] Later on as Yanagita established his methodology, the study of places of origin became the central study theme of the Society of Places of Origin led by Yanagita. I shall deal with Yanagita's study and methodology later on.

---

[1]Kamishima Jirō, ed., Yanagita Kunio Kenkyū [Study of Yanagita Kunio] (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1973), p. 493.

[2]Yanagita Kunio, "Kokyō 70-nen" [Seventy Years since I Left My Home], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū [Collection of Yanagita Kunio's Works] (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1964), vol. 34, p. 188.

[3]Ibid.

Here, I should like to state that Makiguchi realized the necessity of the study of places of origin from his own position. In 1912 when Makiguchi published his second work, Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin to shite no Kyōdoka Kenkyū, he was prepared to spend his whole life as an elementary-school teacher. His strong hope to live as a scholar of geography was destroyed in eight years without any permanent job after he left Hokkaidō and came to Tokyo. In the period of Jinsei Chirigaku, Makiguchi thought that the study of places of origin was necessary in order to find the general rule for the study of geography; in other words, it was necessary from the point of methodology. However, in the period of his second work, the reason for him to value the study of the places of origin had changed; it was necessary from his interest in pedagogy.

In this second work, Makiguchi summarized his theme of education as follows:

> (1) How can we teach young children within the limit of time the knowledge which is demanded by society and the nation and which is necessary for living fully?
> (2) How can we change the difficult educational curriculum, which seems to be useless to the students, into an understandable, acceptable one?
> (3) How can we economize the teachers' labor of teaching and children's labor of learning?
> (4) How can we ensure the students keep what they have learned?
> (5) How can we let the students immediately apply what they have learned to their daily life?[1]

Makiguchi thought that in order to solve the above questions, students should understand what they have learned by organizing and classifying the material from their own experi-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 22.

ences.[1] In other words, what is necessary for the students is the fundamental concept which can become the basis for their organizing and classifying what they learned. Makiguchi thought that this fundamental concept can be obtained only by the students themselves by directly observing and feeling their surrounding phenomena themselves. Makiguchi defined the places of origin as "within the boundary of direct observation."[2] The importance of the study of places of origin for Makiguchi was the importance of direct observation. The study of places of origin was valuable for the students not only to understand what they learned but also to know how they would apply it to their daily life. Just as Makiguchi accepted the study of geography as a study of practical use, he felt education should be for practical use. From this standpoint, he summarized the usefulness of the study of places of origin in the following terms:

> (1) It gives the fundamental concept to the students as a starting point of teaching various subjects.
> (2) It gives the necessary direction of application to the students as the final goal of teaching various subjects.
> (3) It becomes the center of unifying various subjects.[3]

In the study of places of origin, we can also find the characteristic of Makiguchi's thought which was found in his study of geography. It was his pragmatic thought to pursue the rational, economic method for peoples' lives. Makiguchi pointed to Nitobe and Yanagita as people who contributed to the realiza-

---

[1]Ibid., p. 41.

[2]Ibid., p. 110.

[3]Ibid., p. 78.

tion of the education of places of origin.[1] However, this does not mean that Makiguchi approved their study of places of origin as it was.

> Many teachers are stimulated by the scholars of places of origin, who know nothing about education from the professional teachers' standpoint, and enthusiastically state the necessity of the study of places of origin. However, I believe the time will come when the education of the places of origin can accomplish its essential purpose as one means of education as a whole, based on the true purpose of elementary-school education.[2]

Such difference in understanding of the study of places of origin between Yanagita and Makiguchi made their future direction decisively different from each other. I shall discuss this in detail in Chapter VI.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 408.

[2]Ibid., p. 426.

CHAPTER IV

MAKIGUCHI'S STUDY OF EDUCATION

Makiguchi worked as a principal of six elementary schools for nineteen years from 1913 to 1932. During this period, he studied especially pedagogy and school management. In 1916 he published Chiri Kyōju no Hōhō oyobi Naiyō no Kenkyū (Study of the Method and the Content of Teaching Geography). At this time he already had given up his hope to become a geographer and thought that his mission was to give better education as a teacher or as principal of an elementary school. He gradually became separated from the Society of Places of Origin which he joined as a member from its foundation. In the introduction of Makiguchi's main work, Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (the Value-creating Educational System), published in 1930, Nitobe and Yanagita wrote that Makiguchi was a very active member of the Society of Places of Origin and that they were sad to see him leave the Society.[1] Makiguchi stated about this fact as follows:

> Since I started writing Jinsei Chirigaku, I have had interest in the study of places of origin. However, because of my job as a principal, I had to devote myself to studying pedagogy so that I became unable to participate in research for the study of places of origin. In spite of all this, I have had an interest in the study of places of origin.[2]

---

[1]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)" [The Value-creating Educational System], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 1, pp. 398-399.

[2]Makiguchi, "Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin," pp. 408-409.

In 1930 when the first volume of Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei was published, Makiguchi was fifty-nine years old, and it was two years before he retired from his job as a teacher. He wrote this book based on his twenty-eight years of experience of teaching in Hokkaidō and Tokyo. This book was his criticism of the educational situation in those days as well as his proposal about the education of Japan for the future. This work is important for us, not only to know his educational thought, but also to study his entire thought. Makiguchi thought that the purpose of education should be identical with the purpose of life. Therefore, when he talked about education, he was talking about life. In this respect, this work is not only his comprehensive work of education but also his comprehensive work of philosophy.

A. Makiguchi's Criticism of Educational Situation in His Time

Criticizing the educational situation in those days, Makiguchi had this to say about his motivation to write Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei:

> I strongly hope to save the people who have uneasy feeling about education as soon as possible with the cooperation of the people in society. Ten million students are suffering from the difficulty of entering schools, examinations, and the difficulty of finding jobs as if they were in hell. When I think about this problem, I feel myself going mad. I definitely do not want to see the suffering of this age in the next age. Compared with this problem, I think that my success in life is a small matter.[2]

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 36.

[2]Ibid., p. 6.

When this work was published in 1930, the number of unemployed workers was about 1.6 million and the rate of university graduates who could not find jobs was 42 percent.[1] Regarding the difficulty of entering schools, the rate of accepted students for junior-high-school entrance was 36 percent of all the applicants.[2]

How did the educationists in those days cope with such a difficult educational situation? Makiguchi divided the world of education into two groups, a theoretical group and an experiential group. The educationists are in the theoretical group and the teachers who are actually teaching students are in the experiential group. Makiguchi felt dissatisfied with, almost hostile to, the theoretical group.

> The theoretical group has poor effect on the present world of education: What they are doing is just like people dropping eye lotion from upstairs into the eyes of the people downstairs. The theory of education in Japan has been constantly changed for these sixty years. Johann F. Herbart's theory, pragmatism, dynamic pedagogy, free education, project method, and the Dalton plan were popular at various times. The change was as fast as a cat's eyes and also as fast as the present political situation of Asia. The high-ranking people in the world of education have changed their theories in this way, but this change did not influence the lower strata or actual education. In fact, fortunately or unfortunately, the teachers have practiced the old method without changing. Therefore, there was neither danger nor progress.[3]

Makiguchi criticized the educationists who made it their business to introduce the theories of Europe and the United States. At

---

[1] Kumagai, Makiguchi, p. 193.

[2] Ibid., p. 191.

[3] Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 16.

the same time, he criticized the teachers and thought that the teachers should have their own educational theory based on the reflection of their teaching experiences. The pedagogy which Makiguchi aimed at was "the pedagogy created by and for the Japanese people."[1]

B. Makiguchi's Positioning of Pedagogy among Academic Studies

Makiguchi thought of himself as an experiential teacher as well as an educationist. When he tried to write about his thought on education as a systematic theory, it was necessary for him to position his pedagogy academically. Using Emile Durkheim's pedagogy and that of Lester F. Ward as a key, he positioned his pedagogy. Makiguchi's knowledge about Durkheim and Ward was fragmental. Since Makiguchi could not read any foreign languages, he had to know about Durkheim and Ward by translation, but unlike today, the number of translated works were few. Makiguchi obtained knowledge of Durkheim and Ward through articles on these two scholars written by Tanabe Suketoshi who was a sociologist and one of Makiguchi's students in Hokkaidō.

Makiguchi agreed with Durkheim's standpoint that education is a practical theory positioned between science and art.[2] According to Durkheim, science is to explain the reality of

---

[1]Nitobe evaluated Makiguchi's value-creating educational theory in this way. See Nitobe Inazō, "Jo" [Introduction to Makiguchi's Value-creating Educational System], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 1, p. 397.

[2]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 46. See Emile Durkheim, Education and Sociology, trans. Sherwood D. Fox (Illinois: The Free Press, 1956), p. 102.

things as they are without any personal judgment.[1] On the other hand, art is a pure practice without theory and is "a system of ways of doing which are oriented to special ends and which are the product either of a traditional experience communicated by education, or of the personal experience of the individual."[2] According to Durkheim, pedagogy is close to art because of its purpose of practice while it is close to science because it is not simply a system of ways of doing or because the reflection, in order to lead actions, is done according to theory.[3] Durkheim called the studies in this category, such as medicine, politics, strategy, and pedagogy, practical theory. Makiguchi approved of Durkheim's positioning of pedagogy stated above. However, he did not agree with Durkheim's thought that practical theory does not have a higher value than science.[4] Makiguchi thought that Durkheim did not understand correctly the conception of value. Makiguchi's thought was that the object of science is homogeneity among the phenomena, which should be referred to as essence or truth rather than value. Furthermore, Makiguchi thought that value is created by applying scientific truth to environment and that this kind of value should be the object of practical theory.[5]

---

[1]Durkheim, Education and Sociology, pp. 93-94.

[2]Ibid., p. 101.

[3]Ibid., p. 102.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," pp. 46-47.

When we look at Makiguchi's criticism of Durkheim, we find that he was closer to Ward than Durkheim. Makiguchi agreed with Ward's classification of study in pure science and applied science and positioned pedagogy in the applied science. According to Ward, pure science is the study of "what," "why," and "how," and applied science is to answer the problems of "for what." In other words, the former is concerning facts, causes, and principles while the latter is concerning purpose and realization.[1] Following Ward as a key, Makiguchi defined applied science as follows:

> The object of applied science is the value-creating activities of people. Applied science is to find the causal sequence of purpose and means, to establish its rule, and to provide the principle to the people for the value creation.[2]

Based on the above definition of applied science in general, Makiguchi gave this definition of pedagogy as one of the applied sciences:

> Value-creating pedagogy is the knowledge system of ways to educate people who can create value which is the purpose of life.[3]

C. Value-creating Pedagogy

Now, let us look at the characteristics of Makiguchi's value-creating pedagogy and start from his three slogans of pedagogy. These three slogans were not only for his pedagogy but also for his thought and his life.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 54. See Lester F. Ward, Applied Sociology (Boston: Ginn & Company, 1906), pp. 3-6.

[2] Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 59.

[3] Ibid., p. 11.

Start from experiences.
Set value as the goal.
Make economy the principle.[1]

The book, Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei, is based on the above three slogans and is divided into seven parts: (1) definition of pedagogy (positioning of pedagogy in applied science based on experiences); (2) teleology of pedagogy (the purpose of education and life as realization of happiness); (3) philosophy of value (the content of happiness as the purpose of education of life); (4) reformation of education; (5) methodology of education; (6) about teaching materials; and (7) technique of education (rational, economic pedagogy). According to Makiguchi's first plan, he was going to add eight more parts concerning the pedagogy of each subject based on the value-creating pedagogy by compiling the reports of the experimental classes of young teachers who agreed with Makiguchi's pedagogy. However, this plan was not realized. Therefore, the above seven parts were compiled in four volumes and published from 1930 to 1934.

(1) "Start from Experiences"

Makiguchi's first slogan of pedagogy, "Start from experiences," had been his central methodology since Jinsei Chirigaku. He meant two things by this. First, experience for him was the experience of living so that to value experiences was the same to value life. To Makiguchi applied science was the study which is useful for life. At the same time, pure science could become meaningful or valuable when it produces truth which is useful for

---

[1]Ibid., p. 26.

people's life. Therefore, when he wrote Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei, he did not show any interest in studies which he thought did not bring any direct interest to life, such as metaphysics, arts, and religion.

> I also want to study problems which transcend science--metaphysics, arts, and religion. However, I do not have time to think about such things. In actual life, I always have problems that should be solved and realized immediately. Therefore, I do not have time for such leisurely thinking.[1]

Makiguchi knew the sufferings of life through elementary-school children. Among the six elementary schools where he was the principal, four of them offered night classes besides the regular day-time classes, and he also worked as the principal of the night school.[2] The system of night-time elementary school was provided for the children who had to work for their family even before they finished compulsory elementary education. Mikasa Elementary School, where he worked, was located in the midst of the slum area. In order to help those children who could not buy their writing materials, Makiguchi, using the name of his school, bought materials cheaper by the gross and sold them to the children.[3] It was designated as a special school with free tuition and supplies. The school had a big tub where the teachers had the children bathe once a week. Teachers cut the children's hair. Children used school umbrellas; otherwise, many children without umbrellas stayed home from school on rainy

---

[1]Ibid., p. 79.

[2]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 63.

[3]Ibid., p. 65.

days.[1] Makiguchi bought rice cakes at his own expense and kept them in the janitor's room for the children who had no lunch.[2] Makiguchi experienced the poverty and the sufferings of the children and their families. Under such circumstances, it was natural for him to think that the first purpose of study is the improvement of life.

For Makiguchi, since life is the common, universal concern of all people, it has value. Makiguchi tried to find the universality of study in the universal character of the people.

> In order to make a specific study, it needs support and trust of the people, and at the same time, it should attract the people. Man has the instinct of making all the sacrifices for his life. In order to attract him, study should be something necessary for life.[3]

The second thing that Makiguchi meant in his slogan, "Start from experiences," was to carry out education by scientific, positivistic method. By "scientific," he meant to use inductive inference and to prove this inference by experiments.

> We should stop relying only on scholastic study. We should establish a principle by putting together all our precious experiences, prove the principle in our daily classes, and leave the important truth and principle for the next age.[4]

> Religionists often sneer at science. However, recognition obtained by the correct scholastic method, recognition established by the inductive inference and proved by experimental method, is the universal principle.[5]

---

[1]Ibid., p. 77.

[2]Ibid., p. 78.

[3]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 51.

[4]Ibid., p. 18.

[5]Ibid., p. 179.

The daily life of man is the ground for experiment in applied science. Makiguchi tried to make pedagogy, like medicine, a study perfected by many principles obtained through experiments. His belief in scientific, positivistic methodology was so strong that it can be called a faith.

> I feel infinite reliance and strength in the words of positivists or scientists.[1]

Makiguchi pointed out Auguste Comte's classification of human development in three stages, the religious, mythical age, the philosophical, metaphysical age, and the scientific, positivistic age; and he said that this classification is also important for the study of pedagogy.[2] In other words, for Makiguchi, since today is the scientific age, scientific study should be done in pedagogy.

> Today, any profession fails in its struggle for existence if it cannot be rationalized or made more efficient by the improvement of technology based on scientific principles. Education alone is neither scientific nor efficient because the teachers do not have the principle and technique of education.[3]

(2) "Set Value as the Goal"

Makiguchi evaluated a study or an idea by whether or not it is valuable for life. In this sense, he was utilitarian. He thought that purpose is necessary in order for education to be successful.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 20.

[2] Ibid., p. 178.

[3] Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Kyōiku Kokusaku no Konkan-teki Rokudai Mondai" [Six Fundamental Problems of Government's Educational Policy], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, p. 470.

> The immediate problem for the scholars of pedagogy is how to produce achievements. In order to produce achievements, study and improvement of educational methods is necessary. Thus, for the improvement of educational methods a concept of purpose is necessary. The purpose directs the method.[1]

An important characteristic of Makiguchi's pedagogy, which Bethel pointed out, is that the purpose of education is emphasized before anything else.[2]

As explained earlier, for Makiguchi, the purpose of education and the purpose of life should be identical with each other. In the same way that he pursued the universality of study, he also pursued the purpose of education and life by studying the universal characteristic of human beings. Because pedagogists and philosophers were not common people, Makiguchi thought that they did not understand correctly the universal characteristic of human beings.

> How should the purpose of education be decided? As a rule, this should not be decided by scholars. Scholars can decide their own purpose, but they do not have a right to meddle with others. . . . The most important thing is to understand how common people are thinking about the purpose of their life.[3]

Makiguchi thought of himself as one of the common people. He had deep sympathy for poor people and was confident that there existed something meaningful and true only among the common people. Bethel said that Makiguchi obtained this certainty from his several years of experience of severe poverty after the pub-

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 91.

[2]Bethel, Makiguchi, p. 69.

[3]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 111.

lication of Jinsei Chirigaku.[1] This analysis of Bethel's is correct. As well as suffering from poverty, he endured the fact that scholars and university professors did not recognize his study and were satisfied with their abstract theories far removed from the common people. He believed that a truly meaningful thing exists not only in the theory of such scholars, but in the desire of the common people's living.

Makiguchi did not give a definition to the concept of common people. Even though his concept of common people is ambiguous, it is an important concept in his thought because he believed that reality always exists among the common people. He thought that the purpose of education and the purpose of life should be determined by and equivalent to the common people's desire. In this sense, he put strong, even optimistic, confidence in the common people. In order to discover the purpose of pedagogy, Makiguchi studied the thought or the desire universal to the common people; he expressed such thought or desire as "the pure feeling of parents to care for their children without being seized by anything," or "the simple hope common to all the people."[2] Though he did not define his term of "common people," we can see from his above expressions that his image was his school children and their parents.

What Makiguchi finally discovered was that the purpose of life and education for the common people was "happiness." He

---

[1]Bethel, Makiguchi, p. 42.

[2]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 115.

was confident in this conclusion.

> The concept of happy life may differ from one person to another depending on his situation or knowledge. However, once we realize that happiness is the purpose of life and education, nothing else will be able to take the place of this. This is the direct expression of my feeling today which I finally reached after ten years of struggle. Moral life and economic life are both a part of happy life.[1]

As well as "common people," "society" was another central concept when studying the purpose of life and education. He considered human beings as social beings. In other words, human happiness is impossible without relationship to society. This had been his standpoint since he wrote Jinsei Chirigaku. He studied the ideas of Western scholars of society as much as possible through a few translated works, magazine and newspaper articles and lectures. However, Makiguchi was not particularly influenced by these studies. In Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei he did not even mention Franklin H. Giddings, a sociologist, whom he quoted considerably in Jinsei Chirigaku. Makiguchi's thought on society and human beings was already formed when he was writing Jinsei Chirigaku. From his limited knowledge of the Western scholars, he used only the parts which were convenient to prove his thought.

In Jinsei Chirigaku Makiguchi defined society as follows:

> Society is a group of people who have a common purpose and live in a certain specific area because of a continuous relationship. Therefore, each individual is a member of society.[2]

He used this definition of society also in Sōka Kyoikugaku

---

[1] Ibid., p. 119.

[2] Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 235.

Taikei.[1] He explained the society, where each individual is living, as an organic body. Makiguchi analyzed the society as follows:

> (1) Society is made up of individuals. It is just like an organism formed by individual cells.
> (2) The individuals have a common purpose. However, this purpose is sometimes conscious and sometimes unconscious.
> (3) To a certain degree individuals have a continuous, spiritual relationship among one another. It is like the relation of cells of an organism.
> (4) Individuals of a society gather and live in a certain area.
> (5) Individuals, like the form of an organism, unite with one another and form one group.
> (6) Individuals share the life roles of all the members of the society. It is just like the organ of a living thing.[2]

As Makiguchi's understanding of common people was ordinary, his understanding of society was also an ordinary one. The above explanation of an organic relationship between society and its individuals is not an outstanding idea but an ordinary explanation of an ideal, a harmonized situation of society and individuals. When he thought about the purpose of an individual's life, the expectation of the individual's parents was important.[3] This was the ordinary way of understanding the relationship between family and individuals in those days when patriarchal system was predominant in Japan. With regard to the individual, who neglects himself as a social being, he described him as a person having lots of money and living isolated and surrounded by high walls without any association with his

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 149.

[2]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 235.

[3]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 115, p. 117.

neighbors.[1] His understanding of the relationship between the individuals and the nation as a society was also common place. For example, he stated that the purpose of an individual's life is to meet the expectation of the nation. He did not do a close study of nation itself.[2]

When he studied happiness, Makiguchi had two poles, common people and society. Furthermore, he thought that true happiness is realized when the purpose of common people and society become identical with each other.

> The purpose of society should be identical with the purpose of individuals. Society should not use individuals as a means to serve its purpose nor the other way around. The purpose of society should be acceptable to the individuals, and vice versa.[3]

Makiguchi's idea was that the purpose of education is to provide students with the knowledge which is necessary for them to live a happy social life.

> Anybody realizes that true happiness cannot be obtained within the individual himself. If there is a resisting power between the individual's life and social situation which influences his life directly and indirectly, happiness will be immediately denied. We should not be satisfied with egoistic happiness which is that as long as we are happy, we do not care about others. We need to realize that we are in the middle of society and that we will not be able to obtain true stability without coexistence and without coprosperity of ourselves and society, and we should pursue this kind of happiness.[4]

In the third part of Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei which is

---

[1]Ibid., p. 130.

[2]Ibid., pp. 112-113.

[3]Ibid., p. 113.

[4]Ibid., p. 130.

Makiguchi's philosophy of value, he explains about happiness as the purpose of education and life in detail. I shall deal with his philosophy of value later on. However, we should notice here that whatever philosophical expression he took, his image of happiness was, as stated before, an ordinary, idealistic, and optimistic one that the society and the individual will become one organism with a common purpose. Furthermore, even though his thought was garnished with quotations of various scholars, the prototype of his thought was what Makiguchi already had before he wrote Jinsei Chirigaku. He stated the purpose of education in an article written in a certain educational magazine in 1900 when he was a teacher of the affiliated elementary school of Hokkaidō Normal School.

> The purpose of life is education. The purpose of education is to live a happy community life. Therefore, our education of students is to teach and guide them so that they will become good public people.[1]

Makiguchi dealt with the problem of society and individuals as his life theme. We can see the importance of this problem especially when we look at the age in which he lived, the age when Japan was establishing its modern nation based on the ideology of the Emperor system after the Meiji Restoration, and then, the age of Japan as a militaristic nation marching toward World War II. I shall study this problem further in Chapter VI of this dissertation.

---

[1]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Kunren-jō yori Mitaru Takyū to Tankyū" [Age-group-class System and One-room-school System from the Viewpoint of Training], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, ed. Kumagai Kazunori, p. 259.

(3) "Make Economy the Principle"

Makiguchi made the pursuit of happiness as the purpose of education, but the method or principle of education to realize this purpose was based on how economically, rationally, and efficiently education can be given to the people. His idea of "economical" was also an ordinary concept.

> Economical education means education without waste in teachers' teaching energy and students' learning energy.[1]

Now I should like to study his "economical education," by looking at what kind of education he practiced or tried to perform. Makiguchi's idea concerning the study of places of origin, the idea to give lectures and to improve the students' learning ability in relation to the phenomena of the places of origin, most clearly shows his "economical education."[2] Besides this study of places of origin, his teaching method of composition and that of calligraphy are the concrete examples of his "economical education."

When he taught composition to his students, he did not let them write anything freely, but first of all he gave them several examples of expressions and sentence patterns to memorize and then taught them to write by applying what they had memorized.[3] That all students have a general knowledge of sentence expressions and learn how to write most efficiently and quickly was what Makiguchi valued most highly. Therefore, it was not so

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 25.

[2]See p. 40 above.

[3]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 482.

important for Makiguchi to let them have their own original form of expression.

This is also clearly shown in his teaching method of calligraphy. He did not let his students write calligraphy on white paper from the beginning. In other words, first of all he made them put white paper on the handwriting model, copy the letters of the model in pencil, and then write over the pencil marks in brush. One of the elementary-school teachers who worked under Makiguchi as principal stated that the above method was the most efficient one to improve students' calligraphy.[1]

Such methods of teaching composition and calligraphy surely can develop the students' abilities efficiently to a certain degree. However, students educated in this way must have written similar type of sentences and letters without any originality. Makiguchi's education was education for students to become able to live a happy social life. In other words, for Makiguchi composition and calligraphy were not art to develop the students' power of creative expression; instead, composition and calligraphy were the training of skills for taking care of the necessities of society.

D. Makiguchi's Reformation of Education

In the fourth part of Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei, Makiguchi presented several concrete ideas concerning the reformation of education. In order to study how Makiguchi realized his thought, his idea of reformation of education is useful. He summarized

---

[1]Ibid.

his idea of reformation of education in the following six items:

(1) Have school for half a day.
(2) Elect elementary-school principals by examination.
(3) Improve training methods of teachers.
(4) Establish a national inspection organization of educational policies.
(5) Establish a national institute of education.
(6) Establish scientific pedagogy as the main principle of education.[1]

Makiguchi's reformation of education consisted of three elements: (a) to establish pedagogy as the main principle of education; (b) to formulate efficient systems to carry out the pedagogy; and (c) to carry out (a) and (b) as the national policy. Needless to say, when Makiguchi mentioned the national institute of education in the above quotation, he meant the organization to study pedagogy as the main principle of education which was value-creating pedagogy.

The key point to understand the second element, the efficient systems of education, is that Makiguchi accepted education as one technique. As stated before, using the theory of Durkheim, Makiguchi explained pedagogy as a practical theory which is between science and art.[2] He considered pedagogy as a practical theory, but he thought that the practice of pedagogy, actual education carried out by teachers, was a technique. Therefore, he thought that a teacher is or should be a technician.

> The essential labor of teachers demanded by society is the technique of teaching. As doctors are the technicians of medical treatment, teachers should be the technicians of

---

[1] Makiguchi, "Kyōiku Kokusaku," p. 467.

[2] See pp. 46-47 above.

> teaching. The only characteristic of teachers is that they know how to teach better than amateurs. It is better to obtain teachers with scholastic ability. However, it is very difficult to obtain such teachers because the number of teachers demanded by society today is very great.[1]

Makiguchi did not think that a teacher should exist only by teaching the treasure of his knowledge to his students. He said that this idea is especially true in an age of developed communication such as printing technology.[2] Moreover, when we look at present development using cassette tapes and videotapes, Makiguchi's understanding of teachers, teachers as a helper to lead the students to think correctly from their direct experiences, becomes important.[3] He thought that it is necessary to train teachers who have this kind of technique of education. Furthermore, he thought that if the students are educated by such teachers, they can learn the same number of lessons in half the time that they now spend for learning by the existing educational methods. He pointed out that the students can use the other half day for labors to benefit society. In this way, students can study relative to the actual social life while society can make use of their labor power.[4]

As the third element of Makiguchi's reformation of education, he thought that education is an important thing for the

---

[1]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (2)," in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 2, pp. 72-73.

[2]Ibid., p. 57, p. 59.

[3]Ibid., p. 55.

[4]Ibid., p. 224.

nation and that it should be carried out by the nation. When he was working as an elementary-school principal, he often had confrontations with government officials of the Ministry of Education or the leaders in his community because of his idealistic thought of education. For this reason, he was transferred from one school to another.[1] Because of this, he wanted to abolish the bureaucratic system of the Ministry of Education, and prevent interference and inspection by officials of the Ministry of Education.[2] His idea of education carried out under the control of a nation and his idea of abolishing the interference of individual schools by the Ministry of Education were in contradiction with each other. Makiguchi's idea of examination for selecting elementary-school principals was a progressive system, but when this was controlled by the nation, it would become a form of interference of education by the nation. However, these contradictory aspects existed simultaneously in Makiguchi, and he did not think of them as contradiction.

To understand this, one has to understand Makiguchi's optimism about the nation. As stated before, Makiguchi simply thought that true happiness as the purpose of education can be realized when the individual's happiness and social happiness become identical with each other. Also in the practice of education, he felt that the expectation of society for education and the expectation of individual teachers for education could

---

[1]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 73.

[2]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (2)," pp. 150-158.

be harmonized. While he had no confidence in, only hostility for, the government officials of the Ministry of Education, he had a certain confidence in the nation. In this sense, Makiguchi's mentality was similar to that of young army officers who being disappointed in the government, carried out a coup d'ētat because of their belief that the Emperor, being different from government Cabinet members, could understand their ideal. Makiguchi's thought was killed by the state power in the same way that the young officers' ideals were killed.

E. Philosophy of Value

The third part of Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei is related to Makiguchi's philosophy of value, is a summary of his thought. In Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei, Makiguchi organized his thought from his practice of geography and pedagogy, and he positioned his thought in relation to the thought of other philosophers. From the very beginning he felt the necessity to organize and to write his philosophy.

> I have been suffering in the study of value for these ten years. I am driven into a corner with this problem where I cannot get away.[1]

In the introduction to "Philosophy of Value" in Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei, Makiguchi stated that even though he had not organized the problem of value, it had been the central problem of his thought from his study of geography.

> Why do I devote myself to the difficult problem of value? It is probably because my object of study is always in relation to daily life. My Jinsei Chirigaku aims to inves-

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 223.

be harmonized. While he had no confidence in, only hostility for, the government officials of the Ministry of Education, he had a certain confidence in the nation. In this sense, Makiguchi's mentality was similar to that of young army officers who being disappointed in the government, carried out a coup d'ētat because of their belief that the Emperor, being different from government Cabinet members, could understand their ideal. Makiguchi's thought was killed by the state power in the same way that the young officers' ideals were killed.

E. Philosophy of Value

The third part of Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei is related to Makiguchi's philosophy of value, is a summary of his thought. In Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei, Makiguchi organized his thought from his practice of geography and pedagogy, and he positioned his thought in relation to the thought of other philosophers. From the very beginning he felt the necessity to organize and to write his philosophy.

> I have been suffering in the study of value for these ten years. I am driven into a corner with this problem where I cannot get away.[1]

In the introduction to "Philosophy of Value" in Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei, Makiguchi stated that even though he had not organized the problem of value, it had been the central problem of his thought from his study of geography.

> Why do I devote myself to the difficult problem of value? It is probably because my object of study is always in relation to daily life. My Jinsei Chirigaku aims to inves-

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 223.

> tigate the geographical distribution of human phenomena, discover from them the law of cause and effect and clarify the solidarity which ranges over the various fields of society. The object of Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei lies in searching for the law of cause and effect guiding the lives of the students. Needless to say, the object of life lies in the pursuit of value. Accordingly, in studying science (which is inseparable from human life), the problem of value must be a premise which cannot be avoided.[1]

(1) Revision and Addition by Toda Jōsei

"Philosophy of Value" was published in 1931 as the second volume of Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei. It is difficult to obtain an original copy of Makiguchi's "Philosophy of Value," because Sōka Gakkai concealed the original copy for a long time.

Toda Jōsei revised Makiguchi's original "Philosophy of Value" and added some parts to it, publishing his revised version in 1953. Since then for twenty years until 1972, Toda's version was the only copy of Makiguchi's "Philosophy of Value" available. The original "Philosophy of Value" is not found in the collection of Makiguchi's works compiled by Ikeda Daisaku, third president of Sōka Gakkai. Saki Akio and Oguchi Iichi stated in Sōka Gakkai, written in 1957, that they asked Sōka Gakkai to show them Makiguchi's original "Philosophy of Value," but the answer was that Sōka Gakkai did not have it.[2] However, in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, written by the study group of Sōka Gakkai and edited by Misaka Fusahiro, there is a picture of the original "Philosophy of Value."[3] This fact shows that although

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," pp. 217-218.

[2]Oguchi and Saki, Sōka Gakkai, p. 96.

[3]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 102.

Sōka Gakkai has the original, it tries not to publicize it.

One of the main themes in studying Makiguchi's "Philosophy of Value" is to conjecture which parts were revised by Toda and to analyze Makiguchi's original thought. Saki Akio and Oguchi Iichi assumed that the parts written about the relation between Nichiren Shōshū's doctrines and philosophy of value are Toda's revision.[1] Noah Brannen also took the same standpoint.[2]

Evaluation of Toda's revision of Makiguchi's philosophy of value is negative. Most of the criticism is that Toda revised Makiguchi's "Philosophy of Value" for the convenience and propaganda of Sōka Gakkai.[3] However, this criticism is incorrect, because, as will be discussed later, he tried to combine his philosophy of value and the teachings of Nichiren Shōshū from the middle of 1930's. Toda revised and added to Makiguchi's "Philosophy of Value" because he knew of Makiguchi's big theoretical change after its publication and because Toda regretted that his teacher's representative work did not reflect his later thought. In this respect, Dayle Bethel's analysis is correct.

> An example cited as evidence of such editing liberties on Toda's part is a reference to atomic bombs, which Makiguchi could not have known about. This evidence led me to conjecture that Makiguchi maintained his pragmatic position to the end and that it was later leaders who turned the movement to its postwar emphasis on the mystical and metaphysical. This turned out not to be the case. Thus, while there is no doubt that Toda did make changes in The Philosophy of Value, as Brannen points out, it is very likely

---

[1] Oguchi and Saki, Sōka Gakkai, p. 104.

[2] Noah S. Brannen, "Sōka Gakkai's Theory of Value," Contemporary Religions in Japan, vol. 5, no. 2 (June 1964), p. 154.

[3] Ibid.

that he did so fully believing that Makiguchi would have made the same changes and additions had he lived.[1]

In 1972, Sōka Gakkai published a new edition of Makiguchi's Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei. According to Sōka Gakkai's explanation, this edition of the "Philosophy of Value" is not Toda's revised version but is Makiguchi's original with some revisions made by Sōka Gakkai.[2] When we compare Toda's revised version and Sōka Gakkai's new edition of 1972, we discover, as the above scholars conjectured, that the last part of Chapter IV, concerning "the relation between religion and science, morals, or education," and Chapter V, concerning "the philosophy of value as the leading principle of life," are revised and added by Toda Jōsei.

However, the difference between these two editions is not so great as the scholars conjectured. Toda's edition emphasized the gain by the great object of worship (daigohonzon), and stated that believing in the great object of worship was the way for the people to become happy.[3] On the other hand, instead of describing decisively the gains by the great object of worship, Sōka Gakkai's edition of 1972 states that the Lotus Sutra and science do not contradict each other and that religion has its own territory.[4]

---

[1]Bethel, Makiguchi, p. 93.

[2]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei II [Value-creating Educational System II] (Tokyo: Seikyō Shinbun-sha, 1972), p. 3.

[3]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 343.

[4]Makiguchi, Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei II, p. 192.

> Deep in people's heart, they ask a question of eternal life existing in the past, at present, and in the future; they try to find out the eternal law of cause and effect; and they hope to live a happy life by obtaining the absolute standard to judge good and evil. This is the reason why religion exists.[1]

Makiguchi's attitude about religion is more moderate in the edition of 1972 than in Toda's edition.

> I confess that I am not yet qualified to talk about religion.[2]

> Buddhism is neither far from the people's real life nor that of only priests. The Nichiren prayer (daimoku) is not only for the believers of Nichiren sect. . . . At present in the age of the last law when people are living in anxieties, the Lotus Sutra is the best teaching for all the people, transcending the difference of religions or religious sects.[3]

If Sōka Gakkai's edition of 1972 closely followed Makiguchi's original, we should say that the conjectures by Oguchi, Saki, and Brannen are not true, because Makiguchi wrote about faith in the Lotus Sutra to a certain degree in the edition of 1972.

Then, why did Sōka Gakkai not publicize Makiguchi's original "Philosophy of Value" until 1972? The reason for this was probably that Sōka Gakkai considered that Makiguchi's moderate understanding of religion in the "Philosophy of Value" was not appropriate for Sōka Gakkai's strong way of mission by shakubuku (forced conversion). After 1970, as the turning point, when the rapid increase in membership of Sōka Gakkai leveled off,

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 188-189.

[2] Ibid., p. 189.

[3] Ibid., p. 194.

Sōka Gakkai made Makiguchi's original "Philosophy of Value" open to the public. However, the fact that Sōka Gakkai concealed the original copy and used the revised edition as a tool for its mission gave us an impression that Sōka Gakkai would do anything, including the distortion of facts, in order to reach its goal. As stated before, since the 1972 edition has some revised parts, even though it is based on the original, we cannot consider this edition as Makiguchi's original.

(2) Importance of "Philosophy of Value" in Sōka Gakkai Today

How, then, is Makiguchi's "Philosophy of Value" used by Sōka Gakkai today? A clue to answer this question is to study Shakubuku Kyōten (Guidance Book for Shakubuku), the most fundamental manual and one that all the members of Sōka Gakkai are required to read. This book is a textbook for the members of Sōka Gakkai to propagate Nichiren Shōshū. Toda Jōsei wrote this book in order to educate members in a short period; therefore, it is written in easy terms, and even unintellectual members can understand it without difficulty. It was published in 1951, and is the most appropriate key for us to understand what Sōka Gakkai is trying to teach to its members.

This book is divided into two major parts: the first part is about the teaching of Nichiren Shōshū and the theory of Sōka Gakkai; and the second part has various questions and answers to the problems that the members will face when they propagate Nichiren Shōshū. The first chapter is on Toda's philosophy of life; the second chapter, on Makiguchi's philosophy

of value; and the remaining chapters, on the teachings of Nichiren and Nichiren Shōshū. However, after the fourth edition by Ikeda Daisaku, the philosophy of value was changed to Chapter 14 at the end of Part 1. This fact shows that Sōka Gakkai gradually changed its emphasis from philosophy to religion.[1] Furthermore, in Shakubuku Kyōten, most of the parts on Makiguchi's philosophy of value are the explanation of his criterion of ten-stage value judgment; the intention of introducing his philosophy of value is not to introduce his thought but to let the members of Sōka Gakkai use Makiguchi's philosophy of value in their real life.[2] Most of the members of Sōka Gakkai learn Makiguchi's thought only from this book.

Now, let us look at how Makiguchi's philosophy of value is dealt with in Sōka Gakkai Nyumon (an Introduction to Sōka Gakkai) edited by Sōka Gakkai Kyōgakubu (Sōka Gakkai Study Department) in order to introduce Sōka Gakkai to all the people in society. This book starts from Chapter I, "the Purpose and the Happiness of Life," asking the question, "What do human beings live for?" In answer to this question, this work introduces Makiguchi's philosophy of value in relation to the problems of today. In other words, according to this book, the ultimate purpose of life is happiness, and the content of happiness is beauty, gain, and goodness. Next is an explanation that happi-

---

[1]Umehara, "Sōka Gakkai no Hihan," p. 89.

[2]Sōka Gakkai Kyōgaku-bu, ed., Shakubuku Kyōten [Guidance Book for Shakubuku] (Tokyo: Sōka Gakkai, 1965), pp. 253-265.

ness is the fulfillment of life, which leads to Toda's philosophy of life.[1] Toda's philosophy of life and the doctrines of Nichiren Shōshū are emphasized in Sōka Gakkai Nyūmon as well as Shakubuku Kyōten, whereas Makiguchi's philosophy of value is not emphasized in either work. This fact shows that Sōka Gakkai today is using Makiguchi's philosophy of value only for the theoretical foundation to justify its faith of divine favor (goriyaku-shinkō) and is trying to give nothing more about Makiguchi's thought to either members or non-members.

Recently, however, many intellectual people have gradually shown interest in Sōka Gakkai. In the introductory books of Sōka Gakkai written for such intellectual people, Makiguchi's thought is explained in considerable detail.[2] Sōka Gakkai tried to prove that it is emphasizing not only its faith of divine favor but that it is different from other new religions by introducing Makiguchi's thought thoroughly. As is clear from the above explanation, Sōka Gakkai does not place Makiguchi's philosophy of value at its center, but instead it uses his thought flexibly as its strategy of propaganda whenever it is necessary. However, it is true that Makiguchi's philosophy of value is the philosophy of value of Sōka Gakkai today.

---

[1] Sōka Gakkai Kyōgaku-bu, ed., Sōka Gakkai Nyūmon [An Introduction to Soka Gakkai] (Tokyo: Seikyō Shinbun-sha, 1975), p. 18, p. 21, p. 23.

[2] Tokyo Daigaku Hokekyō Kenkyū-kai, ed., Sōka Gakkai no Rinen to Jissen [Idea and Practice of Sōka Gakkai] (Tokyo: Daisan Bunmei-sha, 1975), pp. 19-50.

(3) Makiguchi's Philosophy of Value and Its Background

Now I should like to present the philosophical background of Makiguchi's "Philosophy of Value." For this question, it is necessary to study the philosophy of Japan after the Meiji Restoration (1868). The situation of the world of philosophy in Japan before Makiguchi's age can be divided into two periods, before and after the promulgation of the Constitution of the Great Imperial Nation of Japan in 1889.

The world of philosophy in Japan before 1887 was controlled by the liberal philosophy of England and France. At the time of the Meiji Restoration, Japan changed its national isolation policy all at once and opened its doors to the world. It is only natural that during such a period liberal, enlightening philosophy became popular in place of the feudalistic idea. Philosophers frequently studied in those days were John Stuart Mill, Auguste Comte, Jeremy Bentham, and Herbert Spencer.[1] In particular, all of Spencer's works were translated into Japanese in the twenty years after 1877 and were read widely. The popularity of Spencer was due to two characteristics of his philosophy: one is his ideology of freedom, equality, and rights based on natural law; and the other is his conservative thought, which is to rationalize the law of the survival of the fittest and the actual evolutionary social order.[2] From 1877 to 1887

---

[1] Miyagawa Tōru, Kindai Nihon no Tetsugaku [Philosophy of Modern Japan] (Tokyo: Keisō Shobō, 1962), p. 47, p. 51.

[2] Ibid., p. 61.

Japan was in the age of confrontation between the democratic-rights movement and the absolutistic, bureaucratic ideology. Spencer's conservative aspect was the ideology of absolutist bureaucrats.

The liberal philosophy of England and France could have become the thought of the age when a new system was being established immediately after the Meiji Restoration. However, because of its anti-establishment character, it was replaced by the philosophy of Germany after the promulgation of the Constitution of Great Imperial Nation of Japan in 1889. The Meiji absolutist nation was completed at this time.[1] In 1887 the philosophy department of Tokyo Imperial University invited a German philosopher, L. Buss, as professor to replace Ernest F. Fenollosa, an American philosopher, and Cooper, a British philosopher.[2] Since then, the world of philosophy in Japan, led by Tokyo Imperial University, has been controlled by German philosophers and Japanese scholars who studied in Germany. They taught the history of philosophy and the introduction to philosophy from Immanuel Kant to George Friedrich Wilhelm Hegel; by doing this, they tried to upgrade the philosophical standard of Japan to that of Western countries.[3] Since 1887, the world of philosophy in Japan had been sensitive to the philosophy of Germany. When neo-Kantians became popular in Germany, they also

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 68-69.

[2]Ibid., p. 71.

[3]Ibid., p. 75.

became popular in Japan; when the philosophy of life was introduced in Germany, universities in Japan immediately gave lectures on the philosophy of life; and when existentialism became strong in Germany, it also became popular in Japan.

The philosophy of value became the subject of philosophy in Japan in relation to the neo-Kantians, the leading philosophy in Japan in Taisho Era (1912-1926). Criticizing Hegel's philosophy of idealism, the neo-Kantians, such as Wilhelm Windelband and Heinrich Rickert in Germany, appeared and presented their philosophy using the natural scientific methodology. However, this movement of neo-Kantians was replaced by existentialism with the introduction of Martin Heideggar's Sein und Zeit in 1927. Also in Japan, existentialism and Marxism became popular and created the password, "from value to existence." In this way, the philosophy of value of neo-Kantians was being gradually forgotten in the world of philosophy in Japan.[1]

In this stream of philosophy in Japan, was Souda Kiichirō, a philosopher, who created his original economic philosophy from the neo-Kantian standpoint. He was born son of a banker and himself became a bank president. He had a unique background as a philosopher. He studied neo-Kantianism under Rickert in Germany and became a philosopher and a banker after he came back to Japan. His bank suffered from economic panic, and he died in 1927 at the age of forty-seven. Since his death, the philosophy of value has never become a central subject of study in Japan.

---

[1]Umehara, "Sōka Gakkai no Hihan," pp. 84-85.

However, outside the world of philosophy, Makiguchi followed Souda's philosophy of value and changed it to his own philosophy of value. Makiguchi read Souda's works over and over after 1917.[1]

Souda criticized neo-Kantian philosophy of value and created his own philosophy of value in his article, "Kachi no Taikei" (System of Value). In this article, he stated that truth, goodness, and beauty had been the content of value in European philosophy without any critical analysis since Plato.[2] Each philosopher gave different values to truth, goodness, and beauty. For instance, Hegel emphasized truth as the highest value; Kant, goodness; and Schelling, beauty. However, Souda disagreed with this ranking. His idea was that various values should be placed, not in ranks, but in a parallel relationship, and furthermore, according to him, not only truth, goodness, and beauty but all cultural values should be equally placed.

> Social modes and cultural value, as the theoretical foundation of economy, technology, politics, laws, morals, customs, education, military affairs, and so forth, which are generally considered to be included in ethical life, are not in relation to high and low ranks. For instance, if someone says that economic life is a preparatory stage for ethics or moral life in a narrow sense, it is easy for me to prove that moral life is a preparatory stage which is necessary for the completion of economic life. . . . In other words, these various life styles and values are correlative to one another, and exist independently.[3]

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 216.

[2]Souda Kiichirō, Bunka Kachi to Kyokugen Gainen [Cultural Value and Concept of Limitation] (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1972), p. 77.

[3]Ibid., pp. 102-103.

Souda presented such a philosophy of value because he was a banker. He could give meaning to his action as a banker by placing the pursuit of truth, goodness, and beauty and the pursuit of gain in a parallel relationship. His philosophy of value is one example of the thought of human equality found in the Taishō Era democracy.

> The economic behavior of a clerk's signing checks in real life is not a preparatory stage of a certain ethical behavior. Also, his action is a priori neither higher nor lower than a king's action of signing a letter.[1]

Makiguchi placed the value of gain, which Souda placed in a parallel relation with the value of truth, goodness, and beauty, in the center of all values. In other words, while in European philosophy truth, goodness, beauty, and sometimes holiness are the standard of value, Makiguchi made beauty, gain, and goodness the standard of value.[2] He replaced the truth and holiness of neo-Kantian philosophy with gain. Makiguchi removed truth from his position of distinguishing evaluation from recognition. He thought that the object of recognition was truth and the object of evaluation was value. To him these two should be strictly distinguished from each other.

> Truth is the concept of qualitative equality objectively drawn from substance and from relative phenomena in substance. On the other hand, value is the result of the measurement taken of the relationship between object and subject . . . truth is unchangeable irrespective of person, age or environment, while value is naturally changeable in a similar way, because it denotes the relationship between a person and an object.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 104.

[2] Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 311.

[3] Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, Philosophy of Value, trans.

The distinction between recognition and evaluation and that between truth and value are not as original as Makiguchi or Sōka Gakkai think they are.[1] Windelband stated as follows in his Introduction to Philosophy which was read most widely as an introductory book of philosophy in Japan in those days.[2]

> The division of philosophy into theoretical and practical, which Aristotle initiated, has proved up to the present time the most permanent, and we will therefore find it best to divide the subjects with which we have to deal into problems of knowledge and problems of life, questions of being and questions of value, theoretical and practical--or, as is now said, axiological--problems.[3]

Following the above statement, Windelband divided his Introduction to Philosophy into two parts; the first part on theoretical problems and the second part on axiological problems. His central thought was that recognition and value are not two different territories but instead they are closely related to each other. For him it was "genuine reality" or "absolute reality" that connects existence and value, or recognition and evaluation.[4] This concept of his is close to Kant's concept of Ding-an-sich.

In disagreement with Windelband, Makiguchi did not recognize the dual character of reality, but strictly distinguished

---

Translation Division Overseas Bureau (Tokyo: Seikyō Press, 1964), p. 9.

[1]See Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Shokan" [Letters from the Prison], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, p. 572; and Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 296.

[2]Umehara, "Sōka Gakkai no Hihan," p. 86.

[3]Wilhelm Windelband, An Introduction to Philosophy, trans. Joseph McCabe (London: T. Fisher Unwin Ltd., 1921), p. 30.

[4]Ibid., pp. 35-36.

between truth and value. He did not believe that there is the true world, or truth in the world, other than human daily life or the visible phenomena. This was a criticism Makiguchi had of the intellectual elite. Makiguchi thought that the truth pursued by scholars was not directly related to the life of the common people. Later on, Sōka Gakkai correctly re-interpreted the motivation of this criticism of Makiguchi's against the academic society of those days and stated as follows:

> It is a concept of truth to know how to cultivate rice, and this is different from how to sell or obtain rice. Even though one knows the way to cultivate rice very well, he cannot satisfy his appetite.[1]

In this way, Makiguchi included gain in the center of his value instead of deleting truth from his value. While Souda restored gain to the same status as truth, goodness, and beauty, Makiguchi made the assertion of gain more thorough. Makiguchi realized better than Souda what the common people are looking for. In the introduction to "Philosophy of Value," Makiguchi showed his irritation that philosophy is studied separately from the real life of the common people, and he also stated the necessity of a philosophy truly rooted in the real life of the common people.

> We have no leisure to lose in philosophical meditation. Although it may indeed be better to ponder deeply than to merely sleep, when we contemplate the present world, it is natural that we have no spare time to devote ourselves to metaphysical thinking. No one can say that somewhere there is a man enjoying a truly happy life. The world is fraught with anger, jealousy, avarice, complaint, doubt and arrogance, and all are in agony. Some are in distress

---

[1] Sōka Gakkai Kyōgaku-bu, Shakubuku Kyōten, p. 255.

> for their livelihood; some parents are troubled with delinquent children; some suffer from incurable disease. Even among relatives there is incessant strife.[1]

Makiguchi stated that the purpose of life and education should be identical with the object of the universal desire of the common people. His idea was that happiness, as the purpose of life, was the realization of value which the common people are truly searching for in their daily lives.

> The end of this Philosophy (philosophy of value-creating) lies in enabling every individual and society to attain absolute happiness, and the means is to create values which are the elements of happiness.[2]

Makiguchi thought of value as the relationship between the object and the subject, furthermore as the relationship between life (seimei), the subject of evaluation, and the object evaluated.

> . . . the concept of value means the relationship between object and subject. Among such objects, no value is attached to those properties which are irrelevant to the prolongation or shortening of man's existence (seimei). Therefore, value can be defined as the relationship between human life and its object.[3]

> In recognizing things, we not only come to enter the stage of consciousness and become aware of an object, but to deal with the problem as to whether the recognized thing is true or false, good or bad, beautiful or ugly. In other words, we always grapple with problems regarding life, and judgment by relationship occupies the main part of our work.[4]

Following the idea of relationship between human life as the

---

[1] Makiguchi, Philosophy of Value, p. 5.

[2] Ibid., p. 2.

[3] Ibid., p. 75.

[4] Ibid., p. 53.

subject of evaluation and its object, he defined the three elements of his philosophy of value as follows:

1. Value of beauty--sensory value pertaining to the life of an individual in part.
2. Value of gain--individual value pertaining to the whole life of an individual.
3. Value of good--social value pertaining to the collective existence.[1]

Makiguchi thought that beauty is the same as pleasure, that it is the reaction of a part of our body to the outer world, and that it is the same as likes and dislikes. The value of gain is that life is reacting to the outer world so that it is the fundamental relationship between the subject and object. The value of goodness is after all the value of gain because it is the value of social gain.

Emphasizing the value of gain related to daily life, Makiguchi denied the value of holiness which Windelband regarded as a fundamental value parallel with truth, goodness, and beauty. Makiguchi did not recognize any religious value other than gain, goodness, and beauty.

> By religious value, he (Windelband) meant the spiritual peace which one can attain by saving people from the basic worries of life, but his state agrees with moral value which we have previously considered from a social viewpoint. Moreover, it agrees with the value of gain, when considered from an individual standpoint. But for the purpose of saving people and society, there could be no significance in the social existence of religion. To save people means the value of gain and to save society is the value of good. The words "divine benefit" and "divine favor" may sound fine, but the content is not different. Someone may retort that we can observe the feeling of holiness in addition to individual gain and social good, but the state of holiness is similar to a description of

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 92-93.

> the genuine state of rejoicing in gain and the state of purely admiring a deed of good.[1]

Makiguchi's denial of the value of holiness shows his secularism. When he wrote the "Philosophy of Value," holiness, the fear and the blessings of god that transcends this world, appeared neither real nor necessary to him.

The most ambiguous point in Makiguchi's "Philosophy of Value" is the relationship between gain and goodness. As was pointed out by Umehara Takeshi, Makiguchi valued gain most highly among the values of beauty, gain, and goodness in that he considered goodness as social gain.[2] Then, which did Makiguchi consider more valuable, individual gain or social gain? With regard to happiness, he thought optimistically and idealistically that society and individuals should have one identical purpose and coexist without making happiness of the society the means for the realization of individuals' happiness, or vice versa. This was his idea of true happiness. However, in "Philosophy of Value," he clearly stated that if individual gain and social gain should conflict with each other, the latter should come before the former.

> When "private" interests conflict with the "public interest," it is said that "selfish gain which ignores the public good is evil." In other words, it is clear that selfish gain contrary to public good is evil and the public good opposed to selfish gain is good. . . . A man, who places primary importance on group life, making his personal life subordinate to it, is called a virtuous man.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 122.

[2] Umehara, "Sōka Gakkai no Hihan," p. 87.

[3] Makiguchi, Philosophy of Value, p. 103.

> What then is justice? It is different from truth. The criterion for justice and injustice is as follows: In case of the correlation between the whole and a part, the gain of the whole is esteemed as public gain or profit, and the gain of a mere part is despised as private gain or self-interest.[1]

Makiguchi did not explain clearly why he placed goodness as a social gain prior to individual gain. He only pointed out that an individual is a component of society while the society is the whole.

> Among these changes, however, there is one immutable fact that the meaning of good is determined by social background. Good can be established only by society. Gain and beauty are values pertaining to the individual and good is social value. The reason for the superiority of the latter can be ascribed to the fact that the evaluating subject which obtains the values of gain, loss, beauty and ugliness is an individual who is a component of society, and in consequence the values of gain and beauty have indirect relationship and influence through the individual on society, a group of individuals.[2]

Makiguchi did not even raise a question of how the society or the nation should be. I think that here is the ambiguity and the danger of his "Philosophy of Value."

---

[1] Ibid., p. 110.

[2] Ibid., p. 111.

CHAPTER V

MAKIGUCHI'S UNDERSTANDING OF RELIGION

Makiguchi spent most of his life in the study of education; therefore, most of his writings were on education. However, it is ironic that today he is not recognized either as a scholar of education or geography.[1] The importance of Makiguchi in Japan today is as a religionist, the founder of Sōka Gakkai.

Makiguchi's understanding of religion is the most difficult aspect in understanding his thought and life. The members of Sōka Gakkai who are studying Makiguchi think that it was natural for him to accept religion. They think that when Makiguchi was studying the problem of value, he faced questions which could not be solved by human power and thus found his solution in religion.[2] Horigome Nichijun, the former High Priest of Nichiren Shōshū, interpreted Makiguchi's conversion to Nichiren Shōshū as follows:

> I think what Makiguchi struggled most with the problem of value. He tried to deal with the problem of value in the

---

[1]Makiguchi is not even mentioned in any leading dictionary of education in Japan today. See Shimonaka Yasaburō, ed., Kyōikugaku Jiten [Dictionary of Education] (Tokyo: Heibon-sha, 1956); and Nihon Kindai Kyōiku-shi Jiten Henshu Iinkai, ed., Nihon Kindai Kyōiku-shi Jiten [Dictionary of Education in Modern Japan] (Tokyo: Heibon-sha, 1971).

[2]Kodaira, Sōka Gakkai, pp. 108-109, pp. 117-118; and Kumagai, Makiguchi, p. 240.

> relative world, but he could not. Finally, he entered into the absolute world of the Lotus Sutra and obtained the firm root of his philosophy.[1]

Makiguchi's conversion as interpreted by Sōka Gakkai's scholars is common place and understandable. However, I am suspicious about such an interpretation for two reasons. One is that religion had only a negative meaning in Makiguchi's thought until he became a believer of Nichiren Shōshū at the age of fifty-seven. It seems to me that scholars either have not recognized this fact or intentionally conceal it. The other point is the inconsistency of the change in his conversion. If he felt limitation in the relative world and found a solution to his problem in the absolute world, we should be able to find some fundamental change in his thought. For instance, in the case of Uchimura Kanzō, he started his public life as a scientist, like Makiguchi, and believed in the coexistence of his Christian faith, science, and humanism. However, in his later years, he was disappointed in the relative world and said, "Life is an illusion."[2] What seemed to be "reality" for him was an illusion; consequently, he searched for a more decisive "reality" in the absolute world. This is an experience of conversion. As is mentioned later on, there is no trace of such a radical conversion in Makiguchi.

Then, what did it mean for Makiguchi to become a believer

---

[1]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 111.

[2]Uchimura Kanzō, Shokan [Letters], Uchimura Kanzō Zenshū [Collection of Uchimura Kanzō's Works], vol. 20 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1932), p. 128.

of Nichiren Shōshū? What is the continuity and the discontinuity of his thought before and after his conversion?

A. Before Conversion

Makiguchi's religious background is not clear. His family religion was Zen-Buddhism; the religion of the family that adopted him was Nichiren-Buddhism which was different from Nichiren Shōshū.[1] One Sōka Gakkai scholar claims that Makiguchi's ancestors were believers of Nichiren Shōshū, but there is no proof of this.[2] This idea is propaganda created by Sōka Gakkai, relying on Japanese religious tradition which values each family's hereditary religion. This is a device to make its members believe whatever is convenient to Sōka Gakkai even if there is no definite ground to rely on. This method fundamentally contradicts Makiguchi's positivistic method.

It is not clear what kind of understanding of religion Makiguchi had through childhood and youth. Kumagai Ichijō, assistant professor of Sōka University, said that Makiguchi's experiences in his unfortunate childhood nourished his religious feelings and that he sensed the mystery of the universe by watching the magnificent sight of the Japan Sea in his youth. Kumagai as well as Murata Kiyoaki say that Makiguchi had a strong religious concern from his younger days. But this idea is simply a romantic imagination, and it rather degrades their

---

[1] Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 95.

[2] Ibid.

study of Makiguchi.[1]

The only material left for studying Makiguchi's attitude toward religion, before the publication of Jinsei Chirigaku, is Makiguchi's confession in Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai (a Summary of the Value-creating Educational System).

> I was born into a Zen-Buddhist family and grew up in a Hokke (Nichiren-Buddhist) family, but I had no faith in religion. Most of the teachers whom I respected when I was studying at Hokkaidō Normal School were Christians, but I could not reach the stage of becoming a Christian.[2]

He studied at Hokkaidō Normal School which was next to Sapporo Agricultural College.[3] Sapporo Agricultural College was established in 1876, and a head teacher of this college was William Smith Clark who was the president of Massachussetts State Agricultural College. Even though Clark taught at Sapporo Agricultural College for only eight months, his influence on students was so great that all the twenty-four graduates of its first class became Christians.[4] Among the graduates of the second class were Uchimura Kanzō and Nitobe Inazo. When Makiguchi entered Hokkaidō Normal School in 1889, many of the teachers there were strongly influenced by Christianity.

Makiguchi stated his feelings of religion after he came to Tokyo as follows:

---

[1]Murata Kiyoaki, Japan's New Buddhism (New York and Tokyo: Weatherhill, 1971), p. 76; and Kumagai, Makiguchi, pp. 20-21, p. 239.

[2]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai," p. 448.

[3]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 30.

[4]Suzuki, Uchimura Kanzō, p. 38.

> After I came to Tokyo, I felt insecure in depending only on the morals of Confucianism. So I practiced Zen and listened to Christian sermons. I learned the method of deep breathing and came close to some other teachings. But I did not go into any of them deeply. I had been doing misogi, a religious performance based on old Shintoism to purify oneself by standing under the falls, for more than ten years, but I have never taken the faith of Shintoism truly as my own religion.[1]

There is no evidence that Makiguchi studied Confucianism. However, Makiguchi received education based on the morals of Confucianism at Hokkaidō Normal School. In those days, education given at normal schools was strict, like education at military troops.[2] It was based on the intention of the Meiji government to unify the people of the nation by educating them according to the ideology of the Emperor system. Therefore, education at normal schools emphasized loyalty (chū) and filial piety (kō), ideals shown in the Imperial Rescript on Education and the Imperial Rescript on Military Men. Needless to say, this education was based on Confucianism. Makiguchi was not satisfied with the morals of Confucianism and searched for something else that would give a clearer meaning to life. He did this by trying various religions and various ways of training the human spirit.

Why did Makiguchi not believe in any religion until he was fifty-seven years old even though he came in contact with many? He explained the reason for this question as follows:

> No religion could separate me from my interest in science and philosophy nor had power to harmonize my interest.[3]

---

[1] Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai," p. 448.

[2] Ikeda, Makiguchi, pp. 32-33.

[3] Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai," p. 448.

In other words, religion did not give him the impact to break his reliance and hope in the relative world of "science and philosophy." At the same time, as he said, "The morals of Confucianism are not enough," he anticipated the limit of the relative world. However, we should note that until fifty-seven years of age, Makiguchi's mind was controlled by reliance on the relative world but not by the limitation of the relative world.

Then, what attitude did Makiguchi take concerning religion before he joined in Nichiren Shōshū? I should like to answer this question by analyzing his works before his conversion. Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei was published in four volumes after his conversion, from 1930 to 1934. However, the ideas found in this work were already formed in his mind before his conversion. Contextually speaking, since this work is the compilation of his ideas before his conversion, it should be treated as such.

"Shakai-teki Kyōikugaku no Jitchi-teki Hōmen" (Practical Aspect of Social Pedagogy), an article written in 1901, is the earliest work among Makiguchi's now-existing works which show his understanding of religion. This work was published in Hokkaidō Kyōiku Zasshi (Hokkaidō Educational Magazine) shortly before he left for Tokyo in 1901. Here Makiguchi clarifies the purpose of education as follows: "to make people realize clearly the purpose of society, to make people carry out the intentions of society as their own wills, and to establish a healthy society."[1] In the same article, Makiguchi explained the purpose

---

[1]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Shakai-teki Kyōikugaku no

of education as the realization of public morals.[1] Makiguchi stated the relation between the purpose of education and religion as follows:

> Religionists think that a better society can easily be realized by people believing in religion. However, religion is not enough to save the society of our nation.[2]

In Jinsei Chirigaku published two years after the above work, we can see clearly Makiguchi's attitude of indifference about religion. In "Kaze to Jinsei" (Wind and Life), Makiguchi contemptuously referred to the relation between the harm of wind and religion as follows:

> The areas where the Buddhism is popular and where the Buddhist temples collect their money are the farming areas or the fishing areas, which are directly influenced by the wind.[3]

Makiguchi also made the criticism that existing religions had forgotten their missions to save society and that instead they were only carrying out funeral ceremonies.[4]

Makiguchi's criticism of existing religions does not show his interest in religion, but his criticism comes from his thought that there is no value in religion. In order to clarify this point, it is necessary to study how Makiguchi dealt with religion in Jinsei Chirigaku, such as his statement about the

---

Jitchi-teki Hōmen" [Practical Aspect of Social Pedagogy], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, by Kumagai Kazunori, pp. 265-266.

[1]Ibid., p. 267.

[2]Ibid., pp. 267-268.

[3]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 73.

[4]Ibid., p. 286.

relation between the harm of the wind and religion. Besides this, he did some writing about religion where he classified the relation between land and people and where he classified the ways of people's activities in society.[1] He wrote these two parts only for the sake of the classification and not for the presentation of his understanding of religion. Therefore, his statements on religion are negligible, and the content is so general that we cannot find any existential relation between Makiguchi, himself, and the problem of religion.

Before publishing Jinsei Chirigaku, Makiguchi showed his draft to Shiga Shigetaka, a famous geographer at that time. Shiga wrote his own ideas and criticism in the draft, and Makiguchi published this book with Shiga's statement of criticism in the footnotes. According to Suzuki Norihisa's words, Shiga was a secular man while Uchimura was a man of faith.[2] It is noteworthy that Makiguchi was criticized by Shiga, a secular man, that Jinsei Chirigaku too excessively neglected the religious. Shiga regretted that Makiguchi did not mention the relation between island and religion in the chapter on island.[3] Shiga wrote the same kind of criticism in the chapter on pasture.[4]

Makiguchi's attitude concerning religion is negative in Jinsei Chirigaku. He thought that religion was negative as far

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 262-263; and Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (1)," p. 28.

[2]Suzuki, Uchimura Kanzō, p. 250, p. 253.

[3]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (1)," p. 91

[4]Ibid., p. 167.

as happiness of the Japanese people is concerned. For the realization of happiness, science and education were most important. Also he believed that changing themselves from the people of an insular nation to the people of an ocean nation was essential for the future happiness of Japanese. To him people of an insular nation live on coastal fishing by using nets along the coastal area and praying to gods for the fish to come to the coast, while people of an ocean nation live on deep-sea fishing by going away from the coast to follow shoals of fish. In other words, Makiguchi criticized the negativeness of the people of an insular nation and favored the positiveness of the people of an ocean nation.[1] He identified religion with fishing methods of an insular nation, and science with fishing methods of an ocean nation.

Such an understanding of religion as shown in Jinsei Chirigaku did not change while he was teaching in Tokyo. This is apparent in his work, Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin to shite no Kyōdoka Kenkyū published in 1912. Out of 434 pages of this book Makiguchi used only three pages for religion. His study of places of origin was to let his students directly observe natural and social phenomena in their own places of origin and to help them to understand the relation of nature, society, and human beings.[2] The purpose of this study was, for him, exactly the same as the purpose of education itself.[3] In other words, by

---

[1] Ibid., p. 269.

[2] Makiguchi, "Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin," pp. 125-126.

[3] Ibid., p. 10.

education Makiguchi wanted to create people who could think and choose independently; consequently, the study of the places of origin was the best vehicle for this purpose. Makiguchi believed that standard of judgment should be based on whether the object of judgment is "necessary for one's life," and Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin to shite no Kyōdoka Kenkyū was written with such intention.[1] The fact that he wrote so little about religion shows that he did not feel religion was necessary for happiness.

One other point with regard to religion needs our attention. He accepted the Meiji government understanding of religion and its policies on religion as they were. He dealt with Shintoism, not in the section on religion, but in the section on social education.[2] This shows that Makiguchi accepted the Meiji government's policy to unify the people by the national Shintoism. The government's intention was that, whether or not the people believed in any religion, they should respect Shintoism. They presented Shintoism to the people not as a religion, but as the traditional feeling of the Japanese people. The hierarchy set up by the government for the people went from family ancestor worship at the bottom level and worship of various gods at village shrines at the middle, to the top level of worship of Amaterasu Ōmikami (Sun-goddess), the ancestor of the Emperor, a national shrine at Ise. Makiguchi accepted the government policy as natural.[3] The purpose of this policy was to spread and to

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 137-138.

[2]Ibid., p. 397.

[3]Ibid., pp. 32-33.

strengthen the nation-as-a-family ideology (kazoku kokka-ron) among the people of Japan. As is clear from the above analysis, Makiguchi's attitude toward religion in 1912 had two aspects: negative and common sense (as with his acceptance of the government policy toward Shintoism).

This negative attitude remained the same in his Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei published in 1930. He was negative not only about religion but also about philosophy and metaphysics.

> People will accept gradually that metaphysics no longer has academic value in the world of modern philosophy and that metaphysical explanation does not have any power for the explanation of science.[1]

Makiguchi's main reason for his negative attitude toward religion was that religion is not scientific. The purpose of education for him was that people have their own ideas and obtain happiness. By "people's own ideas," he meant scientific ideas, the ideas which can be proved by experiments.[2]

For Makiguchi, in an age of scientific thinking, the scientific and the positivistic were the most important criteria for the judgment of religions or ideas. He considered the history of human beings as an evolution, and he agreed with Auguste Comte's three-stage classification of human development. Makiguchi thought that the present was neither a religious, theological age nor a philosophical, metaphysical age, but a scientific, positivistic age.[3] His absolute belief in his scientific

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 77.

[2]Ibid., p. 78.

[3]Ibid., p. 178.

way of thinking was not formed by theories but by his own actual experiences. For Makiguchi it was a fact that modern people think scientifically.

> Even though philosophers analyze problems which transcend peoples' lives, they are the only ones who can understand their ideas. Such ideas are irrelevant to the society of the common people because the common people can only understand the things which can be observed and proved in their own life and experiences.[1]

With such an ideological presupposition, Makiguchi did not find any religion that was worthwhile.

Makiguchi did not think that all problems can be solved by science, but that there are problems which transcend science, such as metaphysics, religion, art, and so forth. However, he felt that he had more important and practical things to deal with than problems that transcend science. This is further evidence of his negative attitude toward religion.

> Now I do not have time to think about so many things. I always face in actual life practical problems that should be solved and realized immediately. Therefore, I do not have time for such non-essential thinking.[2]

For Makiguchi, education was the most effective method for dealing with a "problem that should be solved and realized." He knew what was foremost with common people as daily he was confronted with the problems of students and their parents.

B. Conversion

In 1928, at fifty-seven, he converted to Nichiren Shōshū. This was three years before he retired from his job as a teacher.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 179.

[2]Ibid., p. 79.

As is clear from the analysis of his works before his conversion, he had a negative attitude toward religion, and nothing that would lead him into religion.

However, Makiguchi met Mitani Sokei, a believer of Nichiren Shōshū and the president of Mejiro Commercial School in Tokyo. He is responsible for directing Makiguchi to Nichiren Shōshū.[1] Sōka Gakkai evaluates Mitani highly as responsible for Makiguchi's faith. However, in reality Mitani was an irresponsible person. Yanagita Kunio knew Mitani through Makiguchi and wrote the following:

> At the foot of Mt. Fuji there are several temples of Nichiren-Buddhism, one of which is Honmonji Temple where Makiguchi worshiped. Makiguchi became interested in the Nichiren-Buddhism after he met Mitani Sokei. Mitani was a strange man, who often lied.[2]

Yanagita then introduced several lies Mitani told, and writes that Makiguchi broke off his friendship with Mitani.

> I was surprised that Makiguchi came to me and said, "After reflecting deeply, I have broken off my friendship with Mitani." Since then, Mitani has never come to see me.[3]

According to Yanagita's writings, Mitani was not a great person of faith who could inspire other people. Yanagita expresses that it is strange that Mitani is regarded as the inspiration of Makiguchi's faith.

---

[1]Ikeda Satoshi said that a reporter of an educational newspaper introduced Makiguchi to Mitani. Misaka thought that a salesman of teaching materials introduced Makiguchi to Mitani. See Ikeda, Makiguchi, p. 143; and Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 90.

[2]Yanagita Kunio, "Kokyō 70-nen Shūi" [Gleanings from "Seventy Years since I Left My Home"], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 34, p. 467.

[3]Ibid.

If not Mitani, what, then, was Makiguchi's true motivation to enter Nichiren Shōshū? Murata Kiyoaki says that Makiguchi always had a religious thirst and that Nichiren Shōshū could fulfill this.[1] However, as is clear from earlier analysis, this idea is wrong.

Scholars among the members of Sōka Gakkai think that Makiguchi began to believe in Nichiren Shōshū in despair, not only of the relative world, but of science and education also.[2] However, this is not correct, for if we study his works thoroughly, we see that he was not in despair with education and science when he converted to Nichiren Shōshū. In 1929, one year after his conversion, he sent a New Year's card to his friend, saying that he was studying value-creating education. In 1930 he wrote a letter to one of his fellow teachers from Hokkaidō days, saying that education in those days was unfortunately bureaucratic and that he wanted to work in order to realize true education.[3] Furthermore, in Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai written in 1935, Makiguchi said that since he had become positive about himself by faith, he would now do better for education.[4]

Misaka, Kumagai, and Bethel pointed out that one of the reasons for Makiguchi's conversion was his disappointment and frustration about the cultural and political circumstances at

---

[1]Murata, Japan's New Buddhism, p. 76.

[2]Kodaira, Sōka Gakkai, pp. 108-109, pp. 117-118; Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 111; and Kumagai, Makiguchi, p. 240.

[3]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 106.

[4]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai," p. 449.

that time.[1] Japan in the 1920's, before and after Makiguchi's conversion, was in the age of darkness, marching toward fascism. Economic depression was serious, the number of unemployed workers was increasing, and throughout Japan there were many strikes and violent acts caused by the increase in the price of rice. In 1922 the Communist Party of Japan was established. At the time of the disorder caused by the big Kantō earthquake in 1923, members of the Communist Party were arrested and killed by the government in order to maintain public peace. In 1925 Maintenance of the Public Order Act was enacted to punish those opposing the ideology of the Emperor system; eventually Makiguchi was arrested because of this law. After 1927 many banks went bankrupt, and there were strikes in cities and disputes of tenant farmers in villages. With such social unrest, the proletarian movement became stronger. On the other hand, the government continued to carry out oppression by using Maintenance of the Public Order Act and special police power in order to control public resistance. The government tried to find a solution for their problems. They did this by sending 15,000 troops to intervene in the Chinese revolution in 1927. Chinese General Zhang Zuo-lin was killed in 1928 by Japanese invasion troops, and at the same time all socialists were arrested in Japan. That was the year Makiguchi converted to Nichiren Shōshū.

Such a social situation surely brings economic and social unrest to the people, but it was not necessarily a motivation for

---

[1] Kumagai, Makiguchi, pp. 85-86; Misaka, Makiguchi, pp. 93-94; and Bethel, Makiguchi, pp. 100-101.

Makiguchi's conversion. Because of strict, ideological oppression by the government, many socialists abandoned their ideology. However, if we presume that the social situation of the time was a reason for Makiguchi's conversion, we have to prove the presupposition that Makiguchi was a socialist and was against the ideology of Emperor system. Indeed, he was not against the ideology of the Emperor system, and he was critical of socialist ideology.[1] Even though he was arrested later because of ideological oppression of the government, this was not a problem when he converted to Nichiren Shōshū.

Makiguchi mentioned his conversion only once. He stated that before his conversion, he believed that no religion harmonized with science and philosophy, and continued:

> However, the Lotus Sutra does not contradict the theory of science and philosophy, and it is completely different from any other religion that I have known. At that time there were many unusual phenomena in my life, and all of the phenomena coincide with the things written in the Lotus Sutra.[2]

He did not mention exactly what the "unusual phenomena" were. The only thing that he said about the motivation for his conversion was that Nichiren Shōshū did not contradict science or philosophy. It needs to be pointed out that the philosophy of Buddhism in general does not contradict with science or philosophy. If he had studied Buddhism thoroughly before his conversion, he would have known this. Therefore, the reason for his conversion cannot be that Nichiren Shōshū does not contradict

---

[1] See pp. 155-162, pp. 207-208 below.

[2] Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai," PP. 448-449.

science or philosophy, because Nichiren Shōshū is not more scientific than the teachings of other Buddhist sects. The object of its worship is daigohonzon, the plaque on which the title of the Lotus Sutra is written.[1]

Misaka said that Makiguchi became a believer in order to find out whether or not Nichiren Shōshū was logical. Since Makiguchi's position was to value science and actual proof highly without studying other religions comparatively, he could not judge whether Nichiren Shōshū harmonized best with science.[2] For him to choose Nichiren Shōshū as the best religion without comparative study undoubtedly contradicts his scientific positivism.[3]

There is a contradiction between his thought and his decision to believe in Nichiren Shōshū. I think that what made him dare make this contradictory decision and conversion was a compelling motivation: the death of people who were close to him. Yanagita Kunio said that the reason for Makiguchi's conversion was poverty and sickness.[4] Since Makiguchi had a job as principal of a school, he was not really poor so that poverty

---

[1]Makiguchi's understanding of science is discussed in Chapter VI of this dissertation.

[2]Misaka, Makiguchi, pp. 97-98.

[3]Dayle M. Bethel and Yamauchi Tokuryū pointed out this idea. See Bethel, Makiguchi, p. 102; and Yamauchi Tokuryū, "Kachiron o Yomite, Nisan no Gimon ni tsuite" [My Reflection on Philosophy of Value, about a Few Questions], Chūgai Nippō, 12 February 1957, p. 1.

[4]Yanagita, "Kokyō 70-nen Shūi," p. 460.

was not the major motivation. However, the death and the sickness of the members of his family were the biggest reason for his conversion. In 1924, four years before his conversion, his second son died at the age of twenty-three. Immediately after the death of his second son, a young relative in Hokkaidō died. He sent a letter to her parents as follows:

> What a misfortune we both have to face! Furthermore, it is only one month after my son's death that I received this sad news by telegram. I cannot endure this grief.[1]

His study and thought aimed for happiness. However, even though he had this aim, reality for him was a misfortune. This discrepancy between his aim and reality symbolizes a change in his later days.

C. The Teaching of Nichiren

Then, what was this Nichiren Shōshū that Makiguchi believed in? How did he accept Nichiren Shōshū? Nichiren Shōshū was established by Nikkō; Nikkō was one of the disciples of Nichiren who was one of the religious reformers of Buddhism in the thirteenth century. The name "Nichiren Shōshū" means a religious sect which follows the orthodox teachings of Nichiren. Consequently, we first have to study the teachings of Nichiren in order to understand Nichiren Shōshū.

Japan of the thirteenth century was in a period of historical change. The society of aristocracy, government controlled by the Emperor and nobles, was replaced by the society of warriors. The appearance of warriors means that the value of

---

[1]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 97.

blood line is replaced by the value of power. This social change greatly influenced Buddhism. Previously, Buddhism was protected and controlled by the Emperor and nobles. It was used as a tool for their spiritual control of the people, and there were several movements among the Buddhist priests to reform the Buddhism of nobles to that of people. This was the religious reformation of the thirteenth century, the Kamakura Era.

There were three streams in this religious reformation. One is Zen Buddhism led by Eisai and Dōgen; the second is Pure-Land Buddhism led by Hōnen and Shinran; and the third is the faith of the Lotus Sutra led by Nichiren. One common denominator among these three streams is that all the reformists studied at the Enryakuji Temple in Mt. Hiei, established by Saichō. Saichō went to China in the early ninth century and introduced Chih-i (538-597), the founder of China's T'ien-t'ai sect, into Japan. The Enryakuji Temple in Mt. Hiei became the largest and the best school of Buddhism in the thirteenth century. In this school, not only the teachings of Chih-i but also Tantric Buddhism, Zen Buddhism, and other important teachings of Buddhism were taught.

Pure-Land Buddhism and Zen Buddhism both emphasized the added, not the orthodox, parts of the Japan's T'ien-t'ai sect and became new sects, while Nichiren followed faithfully the orthodox thoughts of Chih-i. However, ironically, Nichiren, who kept the orthodox, turned out to be a Buddhist reformer and the founder of a new Buddhist sect.

Then, what was the teaching of Chih-i which Nichiren

tried to follow strictly? The center of Chih-i's teaching was the way of organizing sutras called "the five periods and eight kinds of Buddha's teaching" (goji hakkyō) and the ontology of "the three thousand worlds in a momentary state of existence" (ichinen sanzen). Buddhist scholars in China had to do difficult, philological studies, as there were numerous sutras of Theravada Buddhism and Mahayana Buddhism. Furthermore, those sutras, all of which were considered as the teachings of Shakyamuni, sometimes contradicted one another. Buddhist scholars in China had to organize such sutras, to define the true teaching of Shakyamuni, and to determine the most reliable sutra. Chih-i divided the life of Shakyamuni into five periods and believed that the eight main sutras were taught in one of the five periods. Chih-i thought that the Lotus Sutra was taught in the last period of Shakyamuni's life and was his greatest teaching.

The second point of Chih-i's thought, ichinen sanzen, is explaining the existence of human beings and of the universe by classifying them into categories, a kind of ontology. In other words, Chih-i explained that three thousand worlds exist in one momentary state of mind.

In order to explain human beings and the universe, Chih-i used three categories: (1) ten states (jikkai), (2) ten factors of existence (jūnyoze), and (3) three worlds (sanseken).

Jikkai (ten states) is:

(1) jigoku (hell): the state of suffering from any cause
(2) gaki (craving): the state of being dominated by desire
(3) chikushō (animality): the state of shortsightedly failing to see the eternal fundamentals underlying the here and now

(4) shura (anger): the state of being angry and contentious
(5) nin (tranquility): the state of being peaceful--neither positively happy nor unhappy
(6) ten (rapture): the state of being joyful, as when one's wish has been fulfilled
(7) shōmon (intellectual pleasure): the state of pleasure derived from learning
(8) engaku (learning the law): the state of being ecstatic over having learned a truth
(9) bosatsu (bodhisattva): the state of working for others and the community with courage, wisdom, mercy, and other virtues
(10) butsu (Buddhahood): the state of Enlightenment.[1]

According to Chih-i's ichinen sanzen, the human mind at any given moment is in one of these states ranging from hell to Buddhahood. In each state of mind are found the same ten, bringing to one hundred the total number of states of mind. By using jūnyoze of the Lotus Sutra as a resource, Chih-i explained that ten factors of existence are found in each state of mind. Therefore, Chih-i thought that the mind has one thousand aspects. Nyoze (factor) is the way to be, the way of movement, and the way of relation of existence.[2]

Jūnyoze (ten factors of existence) is:
(1) nyozesō (nature)
(2) nyozesho (function)
(3) nyosetai (a complete fundamental whole)
(4) nyozeriki (potency)
(5) nyozesaku (function)
(6) nyozein (primary cause)
(7) nyozeen (secondary cause)
(8) nyozeka (effect)

---

[1]Murata, Japan's New Buddhism, pp. 45-46.

[2]Murakami, Sōka Gakkai: Kōmeitō, p. 27.

(9) nyozehō (recompense)
(10) nyoze honmatsukyūkyōtō (complete fundamental whole)[1]

As the third category, sanseken (three worlds) is:

(1) go-on (the individual's physical and mental activities)
(2) shujō (the relationship between the individual and other members of his community)
(3) kokudo (the environment in which the individual exists)[2]

Since human beings are not simply an individual, ideological existence but a social existence, and since such each human being has one thousand aspects and exists in the above three worlds, the existence of a human being or the universe has three thousand aspects. Chih-i thought that the three thousand aspects of human beings and the universe exist only in one momentary mind and that we can attain the Enlightenment, the Oneness of the universe and ourselves, by looking into our own mind with a fixed eye. It can be said that this idea of Chih-i's is like the Enlightenment of Zen.

Chih-i did not think that ichinen sanzen was his own original philosophy, but he thought that it was his explanation of the truth of the Lotus Sutra. The Lotus Sutra has the symbolism to express the universe with the number of three thousand, and it also has the thought of jūnyoze.[3] However, Chih-i furthermore thought that the central message of the Lotus Sutra,

---

[1]The Threefold Lotus Sutra, trans. Katō Bunnō, Tamura Yoshirō, and Miyasaka Kōjirō. Revised by W. E. Soothill, Wilhelm Schiffer, and Pier P. Del Compana (New York: Weatherhill; and Tokyo: Kōsei, 1975), p. 52.

[2]Murata, Japan's New Buddhism, p. 47.

[3]The Threefold Lotus Sutra, p. 172.

"one very great cause" for the appearance of Buddhas, is ichinen sanzen.[1]

The Lotus Sutra was the only sutra of the true teachings of Shakyamuni for Nichiren who tried to follow the orthodox teachings of T'ien-t'ai sect strictly. The first task of Nichiren was to criticize other Buddhist sects from his standpoint of the absoluteness of the Lotus Sutra. Nichiren criticized especially Hōnen's Pure-Land sect which began to spread among the people in those days. Hōnen did not deny the Lotus Sutra, but he thought that Chih-i's thought of ichinen sanzen was too difficult to become the salvation of the people living in the age of last law (mappō). Therefore, Hōnen made three sutras, the Large Sukhāvatī-vyūha, the Amitāyur-dhyāna-sūtra, and the Smaller Sukhāvatī-vyūha, the three basic sutras of the Pure-Land sect and taught salvation by Amitābha. Hōnen taught that people will be saved by worshipping Amitābha with the chanting of "Namu Amidabutsu" (I sincerely believe in Amitābha).

Nichiren's purpose, as well as Hōnen's purpose, was to save the people living in the age of last law. The idea of the age of last law is Buddhist escatology and the theory of recognition of history. It was thought that the period of one thousand years after the death of Shakyamuni is the age of righteous law and the period of one thousand years after the age of righteous law is the age of imitative law and after that is the age of last law. In the age of last law, the teachings of

---

[1]Ibid., p. 59.

Shakyamuni become obsolete, the quality of life is reduced, and the world is filled with fighting.[1] In Japan, it was thought that the age of last law started in 1052. In this period Japan was facing historical changes. Collapse of aristocratic society, corruption of Buddhist monks, the appearance of warriors, and violences of monk soldiers took place one after another. Therefore, the age of last law was a reality for the people.

Nichiren criticized Hōnen from the orthodox standpoint that the Lotus Sutra is superior to the three basic sutras of the Pure-Land sect. However, as long as Nichiren's purpose was the salvation of the people living in the age of last law, he needed to make his teaching as powerful and appealing to the people as Hōnen's chanting. Therefore, for this purpose, Nichiren created the Nichiren prayer (daimoku) by chanting the name of the Lotus Sutra, which is "Namu-Myōhō-Rengekyō" (Glory to the Lotus Sutra of the Supreme Law). In this prayer is found essence of the Lotus Sutra, and in the Lotus Sutra is found the essence of Buddhism. Therefore, people can attain salvation simply by chanting the Nichiren prayer. By creating the Nichiren prayer, Nichiren transcended Chih-i even though his starting point was the tradition of Chih-i's teachings. We can say that the Nichiren prayer is Nichiren's interpretation and development of Chih-i's ichinen sanzen. Nichiren accepted Chih-i's ichinen sanzen as truth, but he thought that it was

---

[1]Nakamura Hajime, ed., Shin, Bukkyō Jiten [Dictionary of Buddhism: Revised Version] (Tokyo: Seishin Shobō, 1972), pp. 495-496.

simply one theory so that whether or not it could give salvation was a different matter. In other words, the Enlightenment of the truth of ichinen sanzen by Chih-i's Zen-Buddhist way was too difficult for people of the age of last law. For Nichiren, who valued a practical way, prayer was the way that people can feel the truth of ichinen sanzen at this moment. Consequently, Nichiren called Chih-i's ichinen sanzen, ri no ichinen sanzen or ichinen sanzen of principle, and his own ichinen sanzen, ji no ichinen sanzen or ichinen sanzen of fact. Nichiren's ichinen sanzen was the way to encounter the eternal by chanting the Nichiren prayer.

The eternal for Nichiren was not only the universal or the absolute but also the personal. In other words, the eternal for Nichiren was the Eternal Shakyamuni shown in Chapter 16 of the Lotus Sutra, "Revelation of the Eternal Life of the Tathāgata." In the Lotus Sutra, Shakyamuni is not the existence of historical limitation, but Shakyamuni exists from the eternal to the eternal and is still preaching in this world today.

> Then the World-honored One, perceiving that the bodhisattvas thrice without ceasing repeated their request, addressed them, saying: "Listen then all of you attentively to the secret, mysterious, and supernaturally pervading power of the Tathāgata. All the worlds of gods, men, and asuras consider: 'Now has Shakyamuni Buddha come forth from the palace of the Sākya clan, and seated at the training place of enlightenment, not far from the city of Gayā, has attained Perfect Enlightenment.' But, my good sons, since I veritably became Buddha [there have passed] infinite, boundless hundreds of thousands of myriads of kotis of nayutas of kalpas . . . ."[1]

---

[1] Threefold Lotus Sutra, pp. 249-250.

When we study Nichiren's faith in Eternal Shakyamuni, we realize that it has some similarity with the faith in Amitābha of the Pure-Land sect. Even though there is a clear difference in the object of worship, the former is Shakyamuni and the latter, Amitābha, both are the teachings of salvation by Eternal Buddha. Then, what is original in Nichiren? First of all, it is characteristic of Nichiren to value the orthodox. As the T'ien-t'ai sect was the orthodox of the Japan's Buddhism for him, he thought that the center of all Buddhism should be Shakyamuni. He thought that it was a great mis-evaluation of the matter to value Amitābha instead of Shakyamuni. The second characteristic of Nichiren's faith in Eternal Buddha is that his thought of the eternal has a positive attitude toward this world.[1] The Pure-Land sect taught that the Pure Land is different from this world. This offers only a weak life and a negative acceptance of this world. On the other hand, for Nichiren Shakyamuni is the Eternal Buddha existing from the eternal past to this present moment. Therefore, for Nichiren this world, where the Eternal Buddha is now preaching, has eternal meaning as it is.

Nichiren's positive attitude of the eternal toward this world and his self-awareness of the age of last law gave him a strong sense of history. The age of last law is not a negative age for Nichiren, but it is a meaningful, special age when the true teachings of Buddhism spread among the people. He boldly

---

[1]Kino Kazuyoshi and Umehara Takeshi, Eien no Inochi: Nichiren [Eternal Life: Nichiren] (Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1970), p. 264.

interpreted the idea that the Lotus Sutra itself was written for the people of the age of last law. He thought that Jōgyō-Bosatsu (Eminent Conduct)--the first one among the four bodhisattvas to whom Eternal Shakyamuni gave special missions for the salvation of the people living in the age of last law--was a prophecy about Nichiren himself.[1] He accepted his suffering as the suffering of the bodhisattva caused by his efforts to spread the Lotus Sutra as was prophesied in the Lotus Sutra; therefore, he thought that his suffering proved himself as Eminent Conduct Bodhisattva[2]

Nichiren obtained his strong sense of history as well as his source of power for practice by relativizing historical Shakyamuni with the concept of Eternal Buddha, by finding a special meaning in the age of last law, and by making the present moment more meaningful than the age of historical Shakyamuni. The faith in Maitreya, which comes after the age of last law continuing for the period of 5,670 million years, as well as the faith in the Pure Land of the Pure-Land sect, shows the deep despair of the people about this world. However, Nichiren's "eternal now" brought back the people's attention from the other world into this world.

The positive attitude in Nichiren's faith toward this world values highly the particularistic situation of the people living in the "eternal now" and the results of their faith. There are five items as the criterion for Nichiren to judge the

---

[1] Threefold Lotus Sutra, p. 239.

[2] Ibid., p. 218.

best sutra and the best sect among many. This criterion is called gokō (the five principles): (1) teaching, (2) the readiness of people to accept the canon, (3) time or timing, (4) country, and (5) the sequence in which religious teaching may be spread. What was important for Nichiren was that the teaching be appropriate for people in their own situation, time and place, in this case for the Japan of Nichiren's age.

Besides gokō, there was one more criterion for Nichiren to confirm the relative superiority of sutras and sects. It was sanshō (the three proofs): (1) the proof by document, (2) the proof by logic, and (3) the proof by reality or result. Among these three proofs, Nichiren thought that the proof by reality was the most important one.

> When I evaluate the teachings of Buddha, I value highly logic and document, but above them I value reality or result more highly.[1]

This thought of Nichiren, his positive conception of this world in his thought of the eternal, his high evaluation of particularistic situation, and his serious consideration of reality or result, led him to relate himself to and criticize the happenings of society. His interpretation was that there are various evils and unhappiness in society because the nation does not protect the Lotus Sutra and because people are following wrong teachings. In this way, his criticism against other sects was very severe.

---

[1] Sōka Gakkai Kyōgaku-bu, ed., Nichiren Daishōnin Gosho [Collection of Nichiren's Works] (Tokyo: Sōka Gakkai, 1974), p. 759.

In Risshō Ankokuron (Treatise on Making the Nation Secure by Establishing True Buddhism), he prophesied that Japan would face seven calamities which were written in various sutras, and which would occur when a right teaching died out.[1] He said that five calamities out of seven had already occurred but that the remaining two calamities, a rebellion in the nation and an invasion of Japan by foreign nations, would take place in the near future.[2] This prophecy was fulfilled in 1268 when ambassadors of Mongolia came to make Japan surrender. Immediately after this incident, he told the government and leading temples that his prophecy was correct. Furthermore, he sent them a letter to recommend that they follow his idea. At first, the government simply ignored his appeal. However, since he did not stop criticizing the government and the religious authorities, the government finally sent him into exile. Living in danger on Sado Island, the place of his exile, he strengthened his mission based on the Lotus Sutra and deepened his self-awareness as Eminent Conduct Bodhisattva. Living under such circumstances, he wrote Kaimokushō (Treatise on Eye-opening) and Kanshin no Honzonshō (Treatise on the Attainment of Buddhahood in the Age of Last Law), which were his leading works. In the latter work, he discussed his ichinen sanzen and the Nichiren prayer. Here, he transcended and proceeded to a new religious state from his previous standpoint as an orthodox religionist of T'ien-tai sect.

---

[1] Kino and Umehara, Eien no Inochi, pp. 42-49.

[2] Ibid., pp. 65-66.

Four years after his exile, the government set him free because powerful figures in the government felt uneasy about the outcome of his prophecy. In other words, Mongolia tried to invade Japan, but fortunately Japan was saved by a big typhoon. He left Sado Island and went to Mt. Minobu where he lived a life of meditation and educated his followers. He no longer criticized the government. However, he thought that a government that did not support the faith of the Lotus Sutra and sent him into exile should be overthrown. He went into Mt. Minobu, perhaps because he foresaw another invasion of Japan by Mongolia.[1] Nichiren was a nationalist in the sense that he loved Japan and aimed to establish Buddhism for the people of Japan. However, his ultimate concern was the Lotus Sutra as the true Buddha's teaching. The cold climate of Mt. Minobu was severe for the old man; he died six years after he went into Mt. Minobu.

D. Teachings of Nichiren Shōshū

The history of Nichiren Shōshū starts from Nikkō, one of the six distinguished disciples of Nichiren. Nikkō (1246-1333) became Nichiren's disciple when he was thirteen years old. When Nichiren was sent to Sado Island, Nikkō went with him and took care of his teacher for four years. After the death of Nichiren, his six distinguished disciples took turns taking care of his grave at Mt. Minobu. Nikkō was the chief priest of the Buddhist temple of Mt. Minobu, while the other five disciples worked apart from Mt. Minobu. Consequently, at the second anniversary of

---

[1]Ibid., p. 279.

Nichiren's death only Nikkō was at the side of his grave.[1] Nikkō criticized the other five disciples for what he considered their disrespectful attitude toward their teacher's grave and because of their understanding of faith. They came close to T'ien-t'ai sect after Nichiren's death in order to legitimize their religious activities, losing Nichiren's lifetime attitude of anti-authority and fighting strength. They easily compromised with the political and religious authorities at that time. Nikkō could not accept this attitude of the other disciples because he was very idealistic.[2] Namikii Sanenaga, the lord of a powerful manor in Minobu area, at first supported Nikkō but later changed his support to the other five disciples of Nichiren. Eventually, Nikkō had to leave Mt. Minobu and he settled at the foot of Mt. Fuji, building Taisekiji Temple.[3]

When Nikkō established Nichiren Shōshū, the first of the Nichiren sects, his intention was to follow Nichiren's doctrine and attitude of faith correctly; therefore, in this sense, this sect had nothing new as far as doctrines were concerned. However, over a period of seven hundred years, Nichiren Shōshū has created specific doctrines which are different from the other Nichiren sects. Nichiren Shōshū claims to have kept Nichiren's

---

[1]Shigyō Kaishū, Nichiren-shū Kyōgaku-shi [History of the Doctrines of Nichiren Buddhism] (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1972), p. 11.

[2]Mochizuki Kankō, Nichiren Kyōgaku no Kenkyū [A Study of the Doctrines of Nichiren Buddhism] (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1958), pp. 286-287.

[3]Murakami, Sōka Gakkai: Kōmeitō, pp. 49-50.

teachings correctly. However, objectively speaking, it has created a new element which cannot be found in Nichiren's teachings, and this new element has become the central character of Nichiren Shōshū's teachings.

The characteristics of Nichiren Shōshū can be summarized in the following four points: (1) the understanding of Buddha which makes Nichiren more important than and superior to historical Shakyamuni; (2) the absoluteness of the Nichiren prayer and the specific understanding of the Lotus Sutra; (3) the invention of daigohonzon (the great object of worship); and (4) the absoluteness of Taisekiji Temple.

Nichiren Shōshū's understanding of Nichiren is deification of Nichiren. It is a characteristic of Mahayana Buddhism to believe not only in historical Shakyamuni but also various Buddhas. However, Mahayana Buddhism accepts only Shakyamuni as historical existence and other various Buddhas as trans-historical existence. Outstanding Buddhist priests and religious leaders in Buddhist history are worshipped as bodhisattvas. Nichiren thought of himself as Jōgyō Bosatsu who was sent in the age of last law to spread the Lotus Sutra, and this idea was accepted by various sects of Nichiren except for Nichiren Shōshū. According to Nichiren Shōshū's thought, Nichiren is a reincarnation of the Eternal Buddha in the age of last law. Nichiren Shōshū claims that historical Shakyamuni is also a reincarnation of the Eternal Buddha, but had the power only in the age of righteous law and the age of imitative law of two-thousand years, and has no power

of salvation in the age of last law.[1] The thought of Nichiren Shōshū is that salvation of the people living in the age of last law can be realized only by Nichiren as the reincarnation of Eternal Buddha. Furthermore, not only historical Shakyamuni but also various Buddhas appearing in sutras are all the shadows of Nichiren.[2] This theory of Nichiren as a true Buddha first appeared in the work of Nichimoku in 1380.[3] It seems that this theory contradicts the Lotus Sutra and Nichiren's teachings. However, from the point of view of traditional Japanese thought of god, the appearance of such theory is not peculiar. The distinction between Buddha and bodhisattva is meaningless for the Japanese people who have an animistic idea of god. In this all powerful things, such as nature, animals, human beings, and so forth, are gods. To the Japanese, since there is not much difference between bodhisattva and Buddha, the transition of Nichiren to Buddha developed easily over a period of time. In this way, the theory of Nichiren as true Buddha was created because of Nichiren's strong historical consciousness of the age of last law supported by the Japanese thought of god.

Nichiren Shōshū absolutized daimoku, as it absolutized Nichiren, from the consciousness of the importance of the age of last law. This is the second characteristic of Nichiren Shōshū. As mentioned earlier, Nichiren called Chih-i's thought of ichinen

---

[1]Tokyo Daigaku Hokekyō Kenkyū-kai, ed., Nichiren Shōshū Sōka Gakkai (Tokyo: Sankibō Butshorin, 1962), p. 214.

[2]Ibid., p. 216.

[3]Murakami, Sōka Gakkai: Kōmeitō, p. 61-62.

sanzen, ichinen sanzen of principle and believed that ichinen sanzen of fact was necessary for the actual salvation of the people in the age of last law.[1] Nichiren explained that the source of this thought was the first half of the Lotus Sutra, the first fourteen chapters of the Lotus Sutra consisted of twenty-eight chapters, and he called this first half of the Lotus Sutra shakumon (provisional teaching). Furthermore, Nichiren thought that the teachings of the fourteen chapters of the latter half of Lotus Sutra were necessary for the salvation of the people in the age of last law, and called this part honmon (true teaching).[2] Nichiren thought that Chapter 16, "Revelation of the Eternal Life of the Tathāgata," concerning the eternity of Buddha, was the center of the Lotus Sutra.[3] Nichiren's viewpoint was that daimoku can include all the teachings of the Lotus Sutra. Moreover, Nichiren Shōshū gave strong emphasis to this thought and asserts that the truth of the Lotus Sutra is not expressed superficially in Chapter 16, but is hidden in depth. According to Nichiren Shōshū, this truth can be obtained only by chanting daimoku in front of Nichiren Shōshū's daigohonzon.

Daigohonzon, as the third characteristic of Nichiren Shōshū, is a special mandala. Nichiren's mandala has daimoku in the center and the names of various bodhisattvas and deities

---

[1]See p. 107 above.

[2]Kino and Umehara, Eien no Inochi, p. 257.

[3]Ibid., p. 263.

around the daimoku. One-hundred-twenty-four mandala plates written by Nichiren himself still exist today.[1] However, the mandala plate which Nichiren Shōshū calls daigohonzon is not one of these but is the only absolute mandala which Nichiren gave especially for the salvation of all the people in the world. This is kept at the Taisekiji Temple and is shown only to believers of Nichiren Shōshū. Therefore, it is difficult to describe the mandala in detail, but it is said to be carved on a comparatively large wooden plaque. The daigohonzon first appeared in the fifteenth century. At that time, there were fierce factional disputes among the temples of Nichiren Shōshū, and this daigohonzon was one material evidence created to prove the orthodoxy of the Taisekiji Temple.[2] It is not a question here of whether this mandala was actually written by Nichiren or created by the Taisekiji Temple, but the question is how Nichiren Shōshū accepts this mandala. Their position is that Nichiren's way of salvation of the people in the age of last law is not simply to chant daimoku but to chant daimoku in front of daigohonzon.[3]

Here, Nikkan (1665-1726) systematized the above specific teachings of Nichiren Shōshū in relation to Nichiren's teachings. The three great secret laws are the central thought of Nikkan's theology. The source of his theology is based on Sandai Hihōshō

---

[1]Takagi Yutaka, Nichiren: Sono Kōdō to Shisō [Nichiren: His Behavior and Thought] (Tokyo: Hyōron-sha, 1970), p. 166.

[2]Murakami, Sōka Gakkai: Kōmeitō, p. 66; and Kokuchū-kai Kyōmu-bu, ed., Sōka Gakkai Hihan [Criticism of Sōka Gakkai] (Tokyo: Shin Sekai-sha, 1962), pp. 62-73.

[3]Sōka Gakkai Kyōgaku-bu, Shakubuku Kyōten, p. 70.

(Treatise on the Three Great Secret Laws) which is said to have been written by Nichiren. For many centuries there has been controversy on the subject of whether or not this work is a forgery or was truly written by Nichiren. We have not yet obtained any decisive answer to this question today.[1] By the "three great secret laws" Nikkan meant three extremely important things for the salvation of the people. The three great secret laws are honzon (the sacred object of worship), daimoku (the title of the sutra), and kaidan (the ordination platform). Each of these terms was modified by the adjective honmon no, meaning "of the true teaching." According to Nichiren's Sandai Hihōshō, honzon is eternal Buddha, daimoku is "Nam-Myōhō-Rengekyō" of Nichiren's chanting, and kaidan is the center of Japanese Buddhism established in the name of the Emperor and government after the realization of harmonious blending of the government and Buddhism (ōbutsu myōgō).[2]

Nikkan interpreted Nichiren's "three great secret laws" from the standpoint of Nichiren Shōshū. In other words, when Nikkan said honzon, he meant there were two elements in honzon: one is honzon as the teaching, and the other is honzon as the person. Honzon, as the teaching, is daimoku as the essence of the Lotus Sutra; and honzon, as the person, is Nichiren as the incarnation of Eternal Buddha. Nikkan thought that these two

---

[1]Tokoro Shigemoto and Takagi Yutaka, ed., Nichiren, Nihon Shisō Taikei [Collection of Thoughts of Japan], vol. 14 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1974), p. 372.

[2]Ibid., pp. 380-381.

honzon are united into one, which is embodied in daigohonzon of Taisekiji Temple.[1] Daimoku is the daimoku which is chanted to the secret object of worship. By praying this daimoku, people can understand the truth of ichinen sanzen of the fact.[2]

As for the place of kaidan, there were various opinions before Nikkan appeared in Nichiren Shōshū's history. Nikkan chose the foot of Mt. Fuji, where Taisekiji Temple is now located, as the place of kaidan.[3] Nikkan's idea of kaidan was that it would be the spiritual center for all Buddhism throughout the world, an unrealistic thought for one small temple. However, when we look at the fact that his idea gave the theoretical foundation for the establishment of the religious and political movement of Sōka Gakkai, his thought had an important historical meaning.

Nichiren Shōshū has not shown any progress in its doctrines since the time of Nikkan. Its doctrine was under the influence of Nikkan when Makiguchi was converted, and this is still true today. During the Tokugawa Era, the government's aim was to stabilize the power of all religious sects. A close watch was kept to prohibit any religious propagation movement or activity, with the result that no religious group made any progress.[4] Reports in 1930, two years after Makiguchi's conversion, showed

---

[1]Shigyō, Nichiren-shū Kyōgaku-shi, p. 278.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Murakami, Sōka Gakkai: Kōmeitō, p. 83.

that the number of Nichiren Shōshū temples was sixty-nine, and the number of believers was about eighty thousand. It was a very small sect.[1]

E. Makiguchi's Understanding of Nichiren Shōshū

How did Makiguchi accept the teachings and thought of Nichiren Shōshū as his own? I said earlier in this chapter that his chief motivation for conversion was the experience of death in his family. What Makiguchi sought for was the "eternal." His position before conversion was that the world of the "eternal" is irrational and contradicts scientific rationalism. In this sense, Dayle M. Bethel's point is correct that there was a paradox in his philosophical decision concerning his conversion.[2] However, what Makiguchi wanted, at the time of his conversion, was not philosophical rationality but the "eternal" which could fulfill his vacant mind. He must have found peace of mind in the philosophy of the Lotus Sutra concerning eternal life.

At this point, the faith of Nichiren Shōshū had not become Makiguchi's philosophy yet. His objective was to complete Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei, his main work. The first volume of this book was published in 1930, two years after his conversion, and he completed his principle of education when the fourth volume was published in 1934. His position in this work is scientific positivism and rationalism and is not influenced by his conversion

---

[1] Ibid., p. 88.

[2] Bethel, Makiguchi, p. 92.

to Nichiren Shōshū.[1] Makiguchi had been preparing to write this book before his conversion, and this work was almost completed at the time of his conversion. In other words, the faith of Nichiren Shōshū was necessary for him to mend his broken spirit, but he had not yet organized it in relation to his thought. This situation continued for six years until 1934 when the fourth volume of this work was published. During this period, he lost two of his sons and a daughter--Nagashi (his fourth son) in 1928 at the age of nineteen, Tamishiro (his first son) in 1929 at the age of thirty-one, and Kimi (his fourth daughter) in 1932 at the age of fourteen.

After finishing Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei, Makiguchi began to understand his faith in relation to his thought. When we look at his understanding of Nichiren Shōshū, we find that he accepts some of the teachings of Nichiren Shōshū as they are and that he gives his own interpretation to others. In the last part of "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai" written in 1935, he clarifies the relation between his pedagogy and the Lotus Sutra. In this work, we discover that his understanding of faith based on the Lotus Sutra is the same as Nichiren Shōshū. In other words, he accepted the Lotus Sutra as the only valuable teaching of Buddha for people living in the present, the age of last law, and he believed that this could not be understood without Nichiren. Furthermore, he stated that Nichiren's teaching is truly carried

---

[1]Only several pages out of 850 pages of this book have something to do with the teachings of Nichiren Shōshū, and this part is not important in this work.

on only in the thought of Nichiren Shōshū and is embodied in the three great secret laws.[1]

Makiguchi understood the teachings of Nichiren Shōshū as the creation of happiness, which fit with ideas of value and educational purpose which he had before his conversion. Here, we see his original interpretation of Nichiren Shōshū. He discovered the common characteristics between the thought of the Lotus Sutra and his thought.

> Of course, I decided from the beginning that the Lotus Sutra was the same as my thought. When I had almost completed my thought, that is after I published the first volume of Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei, I began to understand the Lotus Sutra. I was surprised to discover agreement between the Lotus Sutra and my thought. I continued studying the Lotus Sutra discovering that the central thought of the Lotus Sutra is the fundamental way of our life. I was surprised and happy to realize that the rational way of education according to value-creating education is a part of the teaching of the Lotus Sutra.[2]

Makiguchi reorganized his thought in relation to his personal faith in Nichiren Shōshū.

With regard to purpose and sense of value, these did not change for Makiguchi after his conversion. In Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai, Makiguchi summarized his thought which he had developed in Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei. In other words, the purpose of education and life for him is the creation of happiness or value, and value for him is beauty, gain, and goodness.[3] Furthermore, this purpose should be realized in the most rational,

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai," pp. 450-451.

[2]Ibid., p. 452.

[3]Ibid., p. 439, p. 442.

efficient, and economical way.[1] Makiguchi began thinking about the realization of his purpose by means of education and religion at that time. In Sōka Kyōiku-hō no Kagaku-teki Chō-shūkyō-teki Jikken Shōmei (Scientific and Trans-religious Experiment and Proof of Value-creating Education) written in 1937, Makiguchi wrote about religion and education as follows:

> First of all, we should prove whether or not a religion has a value, and after studying the result, decide whether or not to believe in it. In other words, after comparing the values of religions, we rank them, choose the best religion, believe in it, obtain the greatest happiness by doing so, and live happily ever after. This is the hope of all the people and the reason why religion is necessary. This is also the ideal of education. It is the final goal of Buddhism to lead all people to the greatest happiness.[2]

The position of Nichiren Shōshū is to value more highly the works of the people who created the important dogmas of Nichiren Shōshū than the works of Nichiren. Consequently, it is difficult for us to think that Makiguchi studied Nichiren's works deeply after his conversion. Again, Makiguchi's understanding of Nichiren is exactly the same as the interpretation of Nichiren by Nichiren Shōshū. However, when we compare Nichiren and Makiguchi, surprisingly, there is an important similarity between them. This is the strong positivistic attitude toward this world, serious consideration of practice, and practical effect of religion. For Nichiren this world itself is eternal and the purpose of religion is to enter Nirvana in this world. Being similar to this, Makiguchi's purpose of religion

---

[1] Ibid., p. 437.

[2] Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 122.

is to bring the creation of concrete value to people who believe in the religion. Makiguchi realized this similarity with Nichiren's thought and stated as follows:

> Those who worship the true gohonzon can die in peace and enter into Nirvana as is stated in the sutras. However, we should not accept such a lukewarm thought. Unless we can enter into Nirvana in this world, we are not following Nichiren's teaching. In other words, home should become a happy place; business should become prosperous; and everything should go well.[1]

This is a quotation from Makiguchi's thesis written in 1942. Such similarity between Nichiren and Makiguchi can be found even before his conversion.

As stated before, religion for Makiguchi was his own personal salvation at first but was gradually organized in relation to his thought. This change in Makiguchi brought a change in the character of the Value-creating Educational Society. According to the history of Sōka Gakkai, the establishment year of Sōka Gakkai is 1930, the year when the first volume of Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei was published. In the same year, Makiguchi published a magazine, Kankyō (Environment), together with Toda Jōsei. It was a magazine of education without any religious connotations. In 1931 the name of this magazine was changed to Shinkyō (New Education or New Teaching). The Value-creating Educational Society was established for the purpose of human and social revolution based on the thought of value-creating education. The name of this society was changed to Sōka Gakkai (Value-

---

[1]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Hokekyō no Shinja to Gyōja to Gakusha oyobi Sono Kenkyū-hō" [The Methodology of the Study of Believers, Practitioners, and Scholars of the Lotus Sutra], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, p. 515.

creating Academic Society) by Toda Jōsei after World War II. Perhaps, the magazine Shinkyō was at first a purely educational magazine like Kankyō. There are only three issues of Shinkyō in existence; they are February, April, and May of 1936.[1] At this stage, Shinkyō changed its character from a purely educational magazine to a magazine aiming for human and social revolution by education and religion. The April 1936 issue of Shinkyō stated the viewpoint of the Value-creating Educational Society concerning education and religion as follows:

> (1) Mission of Shinkyō: The purpose of Shinkyō is to become a free and fair press for the revolution of education and religion, necessary for life improvement. It shall provide new materials for the realization of this purpose. (2) Advocacy: The improvement of political, economic, and social life is not the central theme, but the reform of education and religion is the fundamental issue. . . . Our ideal is the basic reform of the social life of the nation based on Mahayana "totalism" which corresponds with the national structure (kokutai) and transcends Marxism, fascism, and liberalism.[2]

Even though both Makiguchi and Nichiren Shōshū have the purpose of social, human revolution based on creative value, it seems irrational to connect Makiguchi's scientific rationalism before his conversion and Nichiren Shōshū's worship of the wooden plaque, mandala, symbolizing the Eternal Buddha. What in Makiguchi's thought made this connection possible? I think it was his way of understanding the scientific or the positivistic. Makiguchi had two standards for judging the value of a religion: one was whether or not the religion brings happiness

---

[1] Kumagai, Makiguchi, p. 313.

[2] Ibid., p. 316.

to its believers; and the other was whether or not the religion is scientific.[1] When he judged that a religion was "scientific," he meant that the teaching of the religion does not contradict the theory of science and can be proved by experiment. Therefore, the first criterion is negative, but the second one is very positive.

After his conversion, Makiguchi did not explain the positivistic aspect of religion until 1940.[2] However, as stated before, the proof of reality or result was the most important aspect for Nichiren in order to prove the rightfulness of a religion, and this thought was carried on in the tradition of Nichiren Shōshū. Therefore, we can say that the root of Makiguchi's attitude to emphasize the positivistic standard, the scientific aspect of religion, even extremely after 1940, can be found in Nichiren.

After 1940 Makiguchi asserted his original thought concerning "scientific experiment of religion" and made it the center of the movement of Value-creating Educational Society. At the fourth general meeting of the Value-creating Educational Society held in 1942, Makiguchi stated:

> A research institute of infectious diseases uses guinea pigs and mice as the materials for its experiment. The Value-creating Educational Society is more valuable than the research institute of infectious diseases because we

---

[1] Makiguchi, "Hokekyō no Shinja," p. 516.

[2] His thesis on the relationship between science and religion was printed in two issues of Shinkyō by dividing it into two parts. However, since the issue of the last part does not exist today, we cannot find his thought of science in this period.

> deal with human beings as the material for our experiment. Religions in the past were only theoretical, and they did not have any experimental proofs. Our characteristics lies in the fact that we use the life of human beings as the material for our experimental proofs.[1]

The way for the Value-creating Educational Society to prove the rightfulness of its teaching is by studying the lives of the members who have lived according to Makiguchi's teaching. No matter who did the experiment or how often they did it, Makiguchi thought that if the same results were produced, the teaching was proved to be right. This is Makiguchi's "scientific positivism."

> When everyone lives exactly by a certain teaching, and when it is proved by planned experiments, we can make this teaching a rule.[2]

Such an understanding of the positivistic seems scientific on the surface, but it was pseudo-scientific in reality. As is shown in the above quotation, Makiguchi tried to prove the rightness of Nichiren Shōshū as a rule without any exception, and he thought that he was able to prove it. However, his basic standard is not objective but simply subjective. The information sent by the members to Makiguchi, reporting how happy they became, were the only resource for Makiguchi to prove his thought and the rightness of Nichiren Shōshū.[3] He so desperately wanted to be

---

[1]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Hon Sōkai wa Taizen Seikatsu no Sōgō Tenrankai" [This Annual Meeting is an Exhibition of the Major-good Life], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, by Kumagai Kazunori, p. 341.

[2]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Shin Taisei no Risō taru Taizen Seikatsu-hō no Igi to Kanō" [Meaning and Possibility of the Way of Major-good Life as the Ideal for New Structure of the Nation], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, p. 527.

[3]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Taizen Seikatsu-hō no Jissen" [Practice of the Way of Major-good Life], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, p. 539.

right that it seems to have blinded him. Perhaps, the reports sent by the members were all successful examples; those who believed in Nichiren Shōshū but did not become happier than before must have left Nichiren Shōshū without giving a report to Makiguchi. Makiguchi, whose position was scientific positivism before conversion, could have realized that easily. However, he was driven into a corner by his extreme frustration so that he did not even realize that his idea of science in Nichiren Shōshū was a mistake.

I mentioned that there was a change in Makiguchi's understanding of religion before and after 1934, the year when the fourth volume of Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei was published. The difference between the two periods is that after 1934, he tried to grasp his thought in relation to religion. After 1934, his aim was the human, social revolution by education and religion.

There was another change in his thought. The second change came in 1940 when he began to present his original thought of scientific, experimental proof of religion. This second change is clearly shown in the change of the name of the magazine from Shinkyō to Kachi Sōzō (Value Creation) in 1941. This was not simply the change of the name, but there was a change in the content of the magazine. Shinkyō aimed for the human, social revolution by education and religion, and the members of the Value-creating Educational Society were not limited to the believers of Nichiren Shōshū.[1] Therefore, several intellectual

---

[1]See "Sōka Kyōiku Gakkai Kōryō" [Manifesto of Value-creating Educational Society in 1936], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, by Kumagai Kazunori, pp. 320-321.

people, including Yanagita Kunio, became advisers of the Value-creating Educational Society and wrote articles in Shinkyō.[1] On the other hand, the purpose of Kachi Sōzō was the human, social revolution, not by education, but by Nichiren Shōshū. As a result, members were limited only to the believers of Nichiren Shōshū, and the first task of the members was to carry out a strong mission called shakubuku.[2] We can say that Makiguchi's disappointment in education became decisive at this point. The stronger became his disappointment in education, the more extreme his interpretation of religion became.

In those days, Makiguchi often used the phrase, "taizen seikatsu-hō" which literally means "the way of the major-good life." Henceforce I shall refer to it as the major-good life. From 1941 to 1942 Makiguchi wrote four theses: "Taizen Seikatsu-hō no Teishō" (Proposal of the Way of Major-good Life), "Taizen Seikatsu-hō sunawachi Ningen no Heibon Seikatsu ni" (To Make the Way of Major-good Life Man's Daily Life), "Taizen Seikatsu-hō no Jissen" (Practice of the Way of Major-good Life), and "Taizen Seikatsu no Konpon Genri" (Basic Principle of the Major-good Life). In Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai written in 1935, Makiguchi said that after his conversion, he realized a big defect in his standard of value judgment.[3] In 1936 he wrote an article titled

---

[1]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 114; and Kumagai, Makiguchi, p. 315.

[2]See "Sōka Kyōiku Gakkai Kiyaku Yōkō" [Main Principles of Value-creating Educational Society in 1941], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, by Kumagai Kazunori, pp. 334-335.

[3]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai," p. 452.

"Zen'aku-kan to Daishō-kan tono Konmei" (Confusion between the Understanding of Good and Evil and the Understanding of the Major and the Minor). This work seems to show the change of his understanding of value, but unfortunately, this work does not exist today.[1] However, at least we know by the title of this article that a new aspect appeared in his thought of value which is the understanding of the major and the minor. His thought of value changed gradually and finally reached the stage of a clear understanding of the major-good life.

Then what is the major-good life? Or, what is his understanding of the major and the minor? The answer to these questions is most clearly described in "Kachi Hantei no Hyōjun" (the Criteria for Value Judgment) written in 1942.

(1) beauty and ugliness: It is foolish to forget one's own gain in being swayed by likes and dislikes. Needless to say, it is foolish to forget one's goodness.
(2) gain and harm: It is foolish to forget one's major gain in being swayed by minor gains before one's eyes.
(3) good and evil: It is evil to neglect the question of good or evil in being swayed by loss and gain.
(4) good and evil: Even though it is a very minor evil, it is evil not to be good. It is good not to be evil even though it is a very minor good.
(5) major good and major evil: It is a major evil to satisfy a minor good and to neglect the major good. Minor evil can become a major good if one fights against a major evil.
(6) extreme good and extreme evil: Even the same minor evil becomes more evil as the status of those who carry out the minor evil rises. Therefore, in the case of major evil, it becomes extreme evil. One has to face a major punishment as a result. The case of good is opposite to evil described above.[2]

---

[1] See Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 514.

[2] Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Kachi Hantei no Hyōjun" [The Criteria for Value Judgment], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, pp. 544-546.

To seek for the goodness of individual interest or that of a small group such as the family was not the major-good life for Makiguchi, but to seek for the goodness of a larger organization.[1] He called this "totalism." Distinguishing his "totalism" from the totalism of the government term at that time, he explained "totalism" as follows: "My totalism is not vacant, hypocritical life to verbalize ideals without actual practice, but my totalism is the true totalism to reach perfect happiness which can exist in both the individual and society."[2]

In Makiguchi's late writings there is a new aspect of value, the idea of the major and the minor. However, his understanding of value itself did not change fundamentally. In other words, his basic thought was to emphasize goodness more than beauty and gain and harmony between the individual gain and social gain. Then, what was new in Makiguchi? It is my observation that he emphasized social gain, which is goodness, more strongly after conversion than before conversion. Of course, he stated the necessity of happiness which can exist in both the individual and in society, but he did not evaluate individual gain so highly after conversion. He thought, rather, that a minor goodness (individual gain) in comparison with a major goodness (the national gain) becomes an evil and that to live for the major goodness makes an individual happy. Makiguchi tried to

---

[1]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Taizen Seikatsu-hō sunawachi Ningen no Heibon Seikatsu ni" [To Make the Way of Major-good Life Man's Daily Life], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, p. 535, p. 539.

[2]Ibid., p. 535.

prove this idea through the Lotus Sutra and Nichiren's words.

> Sāriputra! The Tathāgata, by means of the One Buddha-vehicle, preaches to all living being the Law; there is no other vehicle, neither a second nor a third.[1]

> There are three levels of filial piety. The lowest level is to give clothes and food to one's parents; the middle level is not to oppose one's parents; and the highest level is to make one's parents happy by performing good deeds and virtues.[2]

In other words, the "One Buddha-vehicle" of the Lotus Sutra is the major-good life, and he thought that all the ways of living except the major-good life are against the teaching of the Lotus Sutra. For him, the way of living aimed at small goodness and individual gain was the "second vehicle" and should be denied. For Makiguchi, Nichiren's highest level of filial piety was the major-good life.

The relation between Makiguchi's thought of major-good life and the teaching of Nichiren Shōshū is not clear in his writings. Before 1940 Makiguchi accepted Buddha's mercy described in the Lotus Sutra as the principle of life and education.[3] However, after Makiguchi became disappointed in social, human revolution by education, he did not try to relate his thought of the major-good life to Buddha's mercy, but he emphasized punishment.

> A new trans-religion should consider the power of punishment as a serious problem before anything else. As law

---

[1] Threefold Lotus Sutra, p. 60.

[2] Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Taizen Seikatsu-hō no Teishō" [Proposal of the Way of Major-good Life], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, p. 532.

[3] Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai," p. 452.

> without punishment is only a pretense without true substance, god or Buddha without the power to punish evil cannot have the power to protect good people. . . . Whether or not a religion has a power of punishment should be the standard used to judge the value of the religion.[1]

As stated before, Makiguchi's way of major-good life was proved by the words of the Lotus Sutra and Nichiren. However, it was simply a continuation of his understanding of value. The only new characteristic of Makiguchi's understanding of religion after 1940 was the thought of punishment stated in the above quotation. Looking back at Makiguchi's thought and movement in those days, Kashiwara Yasu, one of the present leaders of Sōka Gakkai, says as follows:

> Faith and life are not different matters. We should live a life of gain and loss rather than a life of likes and dislikes; furthermore, we should live a life of good and evil rather than a life of gain and loss. The standard of good and evil is decided by the understanding of value. Even in goodness, there are three degrees. Therefore, we should seek for the greatest goodness. This is the teaching of Makiguchi. Makiguchi further explained that the major-good life is to chant "Glory to the Lotus Sutra of the Supreme Law" and to pray to the great object of worship. Then, some people say that the major-good life can be Christianity. To such people Makiguchi said, "Let's decide by judging which of the two will be punished." Punishment was given to the religions which were criticizing Sōka Gakkai.[2]

We cannot find scientific positivism and rationalism in Makiguchi after 1940. He clung to the pseudo-scientism and pseudo-positivism and became more narrow-minded and more extreme than ever before.

---

[1]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Hōbatsu-ron" [The Study of Punishment], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, p. 552.

[2]Oguchi and Saki, Sōka Gakkai, pp. 64-65.

Makiguchi no longer accepted the broad-minded, merciful aspect of the Lotus Sutra, but instead adopted the concept of shakubuku (method of proselytizing by activism) basing it on punishment of those who did not believe. Makiguchi became so fanatic that he even thought that all the religions except Nichiren Shōshū are heretical religions and even poison.[1] This aroused the antipathy of many people. However, the fact that there was antipathy and adverse criticism against Makiguchi was a proof for him that he was transmitting the true teaching of the Lotus Sutra.[2] By this period Makiguchi had fully developed his understanding of Nichiren and Nichiren Shōshū. Nichiren carried out his mission enthusiastically in an unusual way and as a result suffered persecution. Reflecting on this, Makiguchi justified himself. In 1912 in Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin to shite no Kyōdoka Kenkyū, Makiguchi stated his opinion about religions as follows:

> Freedom of faith is protected by the Constitution of the Imperial Nation of Japan so that as long as faith does not violate the order of public peace, even the government cannot interfere with it. Therefore, teachers should be careful not to hurt feelings of religious believers and neither promote or discredit any religion from their subjective point of view.[3]

Nichiren's thought and Nichiren Shōshū are very exclusive in relation to other religions; however, even though Makiguchi came into contact with these between 1912 and 1940, I do not believe

---

[1] Makiguchi, "Hon Sōkai," p. 342.

[2] Makiguchi, "Hokekyō no Shinja," p. 515.

[3] Makiguchi, "Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin," p. 400.

that this accounts for the extreme difference found in Makiguchi during that period. What, then, made him such an extremely narrow-minded religionist?

Early in this chapter I stated that the death of members of Makiguchi's family led him to religion. Even after he was converted, he lost three of his children. Death of a loved one is universally known to lead one to religion, but it cannot be the cause of such narrow-mindedness. There must be a specific reason in this case. It was his strong aspiration to belong to the academic society as well as his disappointment in this same academic society. When he was thirty years old, he resigned from his teaching job at the normal school in Hokkaidō and went to Tokyo. At that time, he had with him the manuscript of Jinsei Chirigaku. He wanted to make his start in life as a geographer, but even though his Jinsei Chirigaku was evaluated highly, there was no university which was willing to invite him as a professor. In order to make a living, he had to become an elementary-school teacher again. But he retained his strong desire to rise in society through his academic work. He belonged to the Society of Places of Origin and tried to be recognized as a geographer. At the same time, he wanted to be evaluated highly as a leading pedagogist in the world of education. He criticized the pedagogists of those days by saying that they only imported new theories of education from foreign nations without understanding the real situation of schools. At the same time, however, he evaluated pedagogists more highly than the teachers who

are actually teaching at schools.[1] For example, in one chapter of Jinsei Chirigaku concerning the division of labor, he classified society into eight fields and classified each field into four classes. The academic and educational field is divided into four classes: the superior class is doctors and great figures of education; the independent class is scholars and educators; the inferior class is low-class teachers; and the lowest class is unemployed, poor people.[2] Makiguchi probably saw himself as belonging to the independent class. The publication of Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei shows that he tried again to realize the dream he had when he published Jinsei Chirigaku. In other words, since he failed to rise to the superior class as a geographer, he tried to rise again to the superior class, this time as a pedagogist.

However, the reaction of the academic world to his Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei was cold. Some articles in newspapers and magazines give a fair evaluation to this work, but all of them were written by the people outside the world of education.[3] The fact that only about ten people attended the commemoration party of Makiguchi's publication of Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei shows the actual reaction of the world of education.[4] To a certain degree he anticipated this kind of result. In this work, he stated that

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 15.

[2]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 278.

[3]Ikeda, Makiguchi, p. 116.

[4]Ibid., p. 117.

many people sneered at him because he talked about pedagogy even though he was not a scholar of pedagogy. He further stated that officials of the Ministry of Education suggested he do such a study after he retired from his job.[1] He put everything into his dream that this book would receive high evaluation by the academic world. After he published the first volume in 1930, he gave lectures and presentations at various places and waited for the reaction of the academic world to his theory of education. The academic world ignored him by keeping silent. In 1936, Makiguchi wrote about his disappointment as follows:

> Having started with a lecture at the educational conference held at the Tokyo Imperial University in 1931, I presented my theory of education to the academic world. However, there was no reaction. Because of the present situation of education in our nation, I was deeply disappointed in this fact.[2]

During the period that Makiguchi was aiming for the social, human revolution by education and religion, he waited patiently for the reaction of the academic world to his theory of education, but he was disappointed. Since evaluation by society was the most important thing for him, his disappointment in the society of education became disappointment in education itself as the means for his goal. He described this change of mind in 1941 as follows:

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 34.

[2]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Sōka Kyōikugaku ni motozuku Kokugoka (Yomi-kata, Tsuzuri-kata) Kyōju no Kenkyū Happyō" [Study of Teaching Japanese (Reading and Writing) Based on the Value-creating Pedagogy], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, p. 467.

> Scholars think that life and study are different and that life and religion are different, and see them separately. We are doing our best to change this idea. However, unfortunately, the number of scholars is so great and their power is so strong that we cannot do anything about it. I wrote Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei, but they did not show any reaction. Therefore, I decided to give up the method of expressing my thought by writing books, and instead I decided to present the rightness of my theory by presenting experimental proofs of our members.[1]

Makiguchi was not such a revolutionary character that he did not deny the existing power of the government or the academic world. For Makiguchi the ideal way of human life was harmony between the society and the individual, and the ideal society was harmony between social gain and individual gain. Makiguchi thought that there is no happiness when society and individuals are confronting each other. Therefore, Makiguchi's revolution of education was to be completed when the government accepted his thought and when existing educational policies were reformed by the government. This was happiness for Makiguchi. However, at this stage, Makiguchi became disappointed in education as the means and disappointed in society which he thought should have recognized him. Consequently, the only society which was left for him was the Value-creating Educational Society of his fellow believers. Finally, the only way to realize true happiness based on scientific positivism was to carry out experimental proofs of the lives of his fellow believers in a small society called the Value-creating Educational Society.

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Taizen Seikatsu-hō no Jissen," p. 540.

CHAPTER VI

EVALUATION AND CRITIQUE

A. Evaluation of Makiguchi

In this chapter I should like to study the meaning and the problems relative to Makiguchi's thought. The fact that Sōka Gakkai has become the largest religious group in Japan with common people as the majority of its members proves that the meaning of his thought should be evaluated highly. He tried to take a positive view of the hopes and desires of the common people and to establish purpose, meaning, and value of life from this positive view. This thought of Makiguchi should be evaluated highly as this is his original thought, whereas his other philosophies were borrowed from other philosophers. I will come to a critical analysis of this point later on in this chapter.

Makiguchi evaluated the hopes and desires of the common people positively. By doing this, he criticized the intellectual or religious elites who neglected and despised them. As stated in Chapters III, IV, and V, Makiguchi valued the life of common people highly, distinguished between value and truth, evaluated gain as a value, and highly valued gain in religion. All these things were the result of his thought to evaluate the hopes and the desire of the common people positively. After Makiguchi's death, Toda Jōsei developed and completed these ideological

characteristics. Toda went farther in propagating Sōka Gakkai as the "religion that gives gain" by acknowledging the character of the common people.[1] He referred to the object of worship, daigohonzon, of Nichiren Shōshū, as the manufacturing instrument of happiness and stated that if the people worship this, they will get over their illness, earn lots of money, and escape disaster.[2] The fact that Toda and Sōka Gakkai emphasized gain shows that Makiguchi's central thought was understood correctly by them. During Makiguchi's life, the membership of Sōka Gakkai was only 1,500.[3] Since this was during World War II when individual desire was oppressed by the government for the war effort, this number was naturally small. At the end of the war, the government's control over the people's pursuit of individual happiness was removed, and Makiguchi's positive understanding of people's desire was carried on by Toda. Because of Toda's ability to organize and to propagate, the membership of Sōka Gakkai increased rapidly.

The intellectual elites in Japan look at Makiguchi and Sōka Gakkai with contempt because they do not accept the common people's pursuit of material gain so directly and clearly. They look down on the common people and do not accept the problem and criticism of themselves that Makiguchi presented. Because they

---

[1] Tsurumi, Mori, Yanagita, and Shimane, Shakubuku, p. 205.

[2] Murakami, Sōka Gakkai: Kōmeitō, p. 131.

[3] Akashi and Matsuura, Shōwa Tokkō Dan'atsu-shi, vol. 4, p. 179.

despise the worldly pursuit of Sōka Gakkai, few studies have been made about Makiguchi by scholars outside of Sōka Gakkai. This shows clearly that the intellectual elites in Japan are still controlled by the ethics of the way of the warrior (bushidō). In other words, it is a virtue to throw away one's life for his faith or theory no matter whether he is a rightist or leftist, and it should be despised to place the pursuit of individual gain prior to the above. Makiguchi knew well this character of the intellectual elites. Makiguchi thought that such ethics were the "morals only for the people of warrior class whose life was protected by the feudal hereditary-property system."[1] His belief was that the common people had their own special ethics. Problems of his thought will be analyzed later on. However, we should evaluate highly the fact that he pursued the existence of truth in the dissatisfaction and the desire of the common people and that he criticized attitude of the intellectual elites who regarded the common people only as the objects of their education. It was Makiguchi's cry of asserting his own existence as one of the common people that he established the thought which attests to the rightness of the common people's pursuit of happiness and individual gain.

Sōka Gakkai's idea is that the intellectual elites have nothing to do with the common people's religion; therefore, Sōka Gakkai has limited its propaganda to the common people only. The intellectual or religious elites want to attain calm, spiritual

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," pp. 101-102.

enlightenment and peace in religion, which is far away from what the common people are searching for in religion. The common people are searching for the enthusiastic, revolutionary state of mind in religion. After the end of World War II, Sōka Gakkai had to compete with two new religions as its rivals, Risshō Kōseikai, a Nichiren sect, and Tenrikyō, a sect of Shintoism. Both of these two new religions understood the dissatisfaction of the common people and obtained quite a number of common people as members. Sōka Gakkai did not attack Christianity severely even though it stated that Christianity was a heretical religion. On the other hand, Sōka Gakkai ignored Christianity because in Japan it was the religion of elites and they felt it could not understand the common people's strong dissatisfaction, their revolutionary feeling, and their craving for religion.

The fact that a great many common people joined Sōka Gakkai made some intellectual elites reflect on their attitude. Kasuga Shōichi, a member of the Communist Party of Japan, stated as follows:

> Objectively speaking, it is absurd that if one has a faith, he can get over his illness. Furthermore, in order to make people join in Sōka Gakkai, they are sometimes frightened or forced into it. I think such kind of action provokes antipathy of the people. On the other hand, however, the reality is that Sōka Gakkai has attracted many people even by taking such measures. I am sure that Sōka Gakkai has something that responds to the strong desire of the common people who want to be relieved from poverty. Those who are the greatest victims of society today and who want social revolution most strongly do not join in Communist Party of Japan but Sōka Gakkai. This phenomenon proves that the Communist Party of Japan has not dealt with the demands of such people seriously. We should look at the development of Sōka Gakkai as a serious criticism concerning the weak ness of our party.[1]

---

[1]Oguchi and Saki, Sōka Gakkai, pp. 223-224.

The Socialist Party of Japan showed reflection similar to the above and stated the necessity to value the fact that the members of Sōka Gakkai actually succeeded in their self-reform through their faith and became happier than before.[1] Such introspection was presented by the Communist Party and the Socialist Party whose goals are the liberation of the common people. However, we cannot find any introspection among existing religions. In order to make a social movement, a philosophy, or a religion meaningful in a concrete society, we can never neglect the energy of the common people's desire. A philosophy or a religion cannot be truly meaningful if we simply neglect or despise the common people's desire. This is so even if this is an egocentric desire to obtain their individual happiness by neglecting the happiness of others. The appearance of a thought or a religion that can become the subject of mutual criticism is necessary for Sōka Gakkai and even for Japan at this time. The Communist Party is the most likely at present to fulfill this role.

B. Critique of Makiguchi

Makiguchi's attitude to value common people highly is, in other words, his attitude to value the particularistic highly. I think that a thought or a religion should have not only a particularistic element but also a universal element in order to become meaningful in a society. The particularistic element is

---

[1] Chūō Tō Gakkō, Sōka Gakkai, Sono Mondaiten [Problems of Sōka Gakkai] (Tokyo: Nihon Shakaitō Kikanshi-kyoku, 1962), p. 6.

a cultural or religious tradition of that thought or religion, which exists most distinctly among common people. Any thought that neglects the particularistic element cannot become meaningful even if it has the universal truth.

The universal element is the power of thought or religion which transcends the cultural and religious tradition which is particularistic. If a religion or a thought does not have the universal element, it is identical with the cultural and religious tradition of the society. Believers of such a religion or a thought may become narrow-minded, believing that their society and tradition are the absolute. But when a religion or a thought has both elements, the particularistic and the universal, it becomes meaningful to its society.

Was there a universal element in Makiguchi's thought? Judging from the fact that Makiguchi was arrested by a militaristic government controlled by the ideology of Emperor system, and the fact that he died in prison one year before the end of World War II, Toda and Sōka Gakkai today assert that Makiguchi's thought and his faith had the universal element which transcends the ideology of the Emperor system as the particularistic element.[1] In those days, the militaristic government tried to unify the nation by worship of the Emperor, and it strictly controlled thought and religion both legally and administratively. The government forced all religious organizations to change their

---

[1]Uefuji Kazuyuki and Oono Yasuo, ed., Kakumei no Taiga: Sōka Gakkai 45-nen-shi [A Large River of Revolution: History of Sōka Gakkai from 1930 to 1975] (Tokyo: Seikyō Shinbun-sha, 1976), pp. 52-58.

doctrines so that they did not contradict with Emperor worship. Those religious groups that rejected this order were forced by the government to abandon their faith through various means including torture. Makiguchi and Toda as well as several other religionists and Marxists never gave up their faith. However, I think it is dangerous to make the judgment that Makiguchi's thought had the universal element, by looking only at the above fact. It is necessary to study in further detail to what extent Makiguchi did or did not resist the ideology of Emperor system.

(1) Martyrdom

During the period from 1928, when Makiguchi converted to Nichiren Shōshū, to 1944, when he died in prison, Japan was in a dark age, under militarism, fighting in World War II, and marching to its defeat. In 1928 Japan began its invasion of Manchuria; in 1932 the Japanese government declared the establishment of the nation of Manchuria by ignoring world opinion. In 1937 Japan invaded China. In 1939, when the first general meeting of the Value-creating Educational Society was held, World War II broke out in Europe. The Japanese military government enacted the Law of National Mobilization in 1938. The enactment of this law by Imperial order allowed the fascist establishment to gather and use all human and material resources for the war. In order to control and use even religions for the war, the Japanese military government enacted the Law of Religious Organizations. Through this law, the government united religious sects as much as possible in order to control them

easily. In this way, the government maintained strict control over religions that were against the ideology of Emperor system. Without exception, the government demanded Nichiren Shōshū to unite with other Nichiren sects. However, even though the priests of Nichiren Shōshū accepted the demand of the government, the members of the Value-creating Educational Society were against the priests' decision and finally made the government approve Nichiren Shōshū as an independent religious organization.

The main intention of the government's religious policy was to unify the nation by the establishment of Emperor worship and national Shintoism with the central, imperial shrine at Ise. As long as religious organizations did not oppose this, their freedom of faith was protected. The government position was that the people had a natural moral responsibility to respect Shintoism and to worship the Emperor no matter what religion they believed in. The sixteenth article of the Law of Religious Organizations states:

> When a religious organization or a religious teacher carries out propaganda of doctrines and performs rituals and other religious activities which disturb public order or go against what is the responsibility of the Emperor's people, the Minister of Education can limit or ban such activities, and also he can suspend the teacher's job and disband the religious organization.[1]

Conflict between the government and religious organizations arose as to whether or not it was the "responsibility of the Emperor's people" to worship the Emperor and to worship at Shinto shrines. The government enforced its decree not only by the Law of Reli-

---

[1]Akashi and Matsuura, Shōwa Tokkō Dan'atsu-shi, vol. 4, p. 318.

gious Organizations but also by the Maintenance of Public Order Act. This law was enacted in 1925 in order to regulate the activities of communists and to control organizations or individuals aiming for the reformation of the national structure and for the negation of personal property. Some new religions, such as Ōmotokyō, Hito-no-michi, and Tenri-honmichi, were oppressed by the government from 1935 to 1938 because of this Maintenance of Public Order Act. In 1941 this law was further strengthened. The seventh article of this law states:

> The founders, official members, and leaders of organizations established for the purpose of rejecting the national structure or debasing the dignity of the Imperial family and Shinto priests shall be imprisoned for more than four years to life at hard labor. Those who join such organizations or those who help accomplish the purpose of such organizations shall be sentenced to more than one year at hard labor.[1]

The government started its oppression of the Value-creating Educational Society by the suppression of its organ, Kachi Sōzō. The reason for this suppression was that Makiguchi implicitly criticized the government in this magazine by stating that one shall be punished if he criticizes the believers of the Lotus Sutra.[2] This happened in May 1942. In August of the same year, at the fifth convention of the Value-creating Educational Society, Makiguchi criticized a speech of Tōjō Hideki, the Prime Minister at that time. Prime Minister Tōjō stated that all the people of Japan should cooperate with one another by walking in the direction provided by the government. Regarding this state-

---

[1]Misaka, Makiguchi, p. 144.

[2]Makiguchi, "Hōbatsu-ron," p. 552.

ment, Makiguchi said, "Of more value than the direction is the goal itself which decides the direction," thus implying that there is a more important goal than victory in war. The Special High Police were secretly investigating Makiguchi and members of the Value-creating Educational Society, and in June and July 1943, twenty-one leaders, including Makiguchi, were arrested for violation of the Maintenance of Public Order Act.

According to the record of the Special High Police, the arrested members of the Value-creating Educational Society made statements against the Maintenance of Public Order Act--the statements such as, "the Emperor is an ordinary man," "it is not necessary to teach loyalty by means of the Imperial Rescript on Education," "those who criticize the Lotus Sutra will be punished," "it is not necessary to worship Ise Shrine," "all the altars except the mandala of Nichiren Shōshū should be burned down," and so forth.[1] Makiguchi was questioned and a record was kept by the Special High Police.[2]

They questioned Makiguchi regarding the purpose of the Value-creating Educational Society, the doctrines of Nichiren Shōshū, the Lotus Sutra, and the teachings of Nichiren. In particular, the central point of the examination was the relation between Nichiren Shōshū's age of the last law and the social structure of Japan of that time. Here is an example.

---

[1]Akashi and Matsuura, Shōwa Tokkō Dan'atsu-shi, vol. 4, p. 154.

[2]Ibid., pp. 158-179.

> Question: From the standpoint of the Lotus Sutra, is present day Japan in the age of last law and filled with evil?
>
> Answer: One-thousand years after the death of Shakyamuni is the age of righteous law, one-thousand years after that is the age of imitative law, and after that is the age of last law when the Lotus Sutra is abandoned by the people and when society is filled with evil and confusion. This states the situation of the whole world, and Japan is not an exception. This is prophesied in the Lotus Sutra. In fact, historical facts prove that this society of the age of last law appeared in Japan. Seven-hundred years ago Nichiren tried to enlighten the people who abandoned the Lotus Sutra, but the result was that Nichiren had to suffer persecution. . . . As a result, Japan experienced many difficulties. The present war between Japan and China and also the Pacific War happened because the nation did not support the Lotus Sutra. Therefore, if all the people of the nation, including the Emperor, worship the mandala of the Eternal Buddha, our nation will be saved from disasters such as war, starvation, and epidemic disease, and the people will be able to live their daily lives happily. This is our ultimate hope.[1]

This shows that Makiguchi identified himself with Nichiren and thus gained meaning from his arrest and suffering at the hands of the government.

Makiguchi thought that the Emperor is an ordinary man. For him, the fact that the Emperor studied at school and was advised by his tutor at the beginning of the Meiji Era was the proof for this. Indeed, if the Emperor were divine, he would not need to be educated. Makiguchi went further to say that if the Emperor believed in Nichiren Shōshū, he would be able to carry out politics without mistakes.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 170-179.

[2] Ibid., p. 172.

With regard to "it is not necessary to teach loyalty by means of the Imperial Rescript on Education," Makiguchi stated as follows:

> Question: You said to the members of the Value-creating Educational Society that the words in the Imperial Rescript on Education--"the people should be loyal to the Emperor"--are not the Emperor's words. Why?
>
> Answer: If the Emperor himself says to his people to be loyal, this statement impairs his dignity. Even without such instruction from the Emperor, the people of Japan show loyalty to him, which I think is the way of the Emperor's people.[1]

In reference to relationship between the faith of Nichiren Shōshū and the worship of shrines, Makiguchi's position was the same as Nichiren's understanding of Shintoism: that the deities are the guardian of the Lotus Sutra. Furthermore, Makiguchi stated that the deities had already left the shrines and ascended to heaven because the nation defamed the Lotus Sutra, and consequently there are only demons in shrines; therefore, the people do not have to worship at shrines, even the Imperial Ise Shrine.[2] This is the traditional standpoint of Nichiren Shōshū. Makiguchi believed that refusing to worship at Ise Shrine did not mean rejection of worship of the Emperor. Therefore, Makiguchi stated that if the people have the feeling of respect for the Emperor, it is not necessary for them to worship at the Ise Shrine.[3] In this way, Makiguchi rejected worship at the Ise Shrine, but his feeling about the Emperor was

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 174.

[3] Ibid., p. 175.

passionate and pious.

> The prayer of the people of our nation cannot be answered in any other way but through the Emperor. . . . The Emperor has shown mercy to all the people through government organizations.[1]

We cannot unquestionably accept the above content by the Special High Police as it is. The purpose of such an examination was not to understand correctly what the examined person said but to prove, by using the unilateral frame-up method, that the examined person impaired the Maintenance of the Public Order Act. They may have emphasized Makiguchi's opposition to the total ideology of the Emperor system, while at the same time they may have underestimated his positive statements and feelings of loyalty toward the Emperor. The latter is based on reliable evidence. Following Nichiren's criticism of the nation by declaring the absoluteness of the Lotus Sutra, Makiguchi criticized the government use of the Ise Shrine by declaring the absoluteness of the Lotus Sutra. On the basis of the Lotus Sutra Makiguchi viewed the Emperor as an ordinary man, but at the same time he had a tremendous respect for the Emperor. This respect was akin to faith, and he did not oppose the absolute policies of the government based on the Emperor system. Although he negated national Shintoism which was the government means to absolutize the Emperor, Makiguchi could not transcend the ideology of the Emperor system because he had a feeling of worship toward the Emperor. When Makiguchi was arrested in 1943, the Pacific War had become disadvantageous to Japan; therefore, the

---

[1]Ibid.

government felt the urgent need to encourage the people to fight and to enforce strong controls. Under these circumstances, the government could not ignore Makiguchi's statement, even though it was not a total negation of the Emperor system. After five months of examination, Makiguchi was prosecuted for being disloyal to the Ise Shrine.[1]

Prosecuted members of the Value-creating Educational Society, including Makiguchi, were put in jail and were examined again and again. Most of the prosecuted members abandoned their faith, admitting their crime. Makiguchi died in prison. Toda Jōsei was sentenced to three years of imprisonment at hard labor and five years of probation; Yajima Shūhei received three years of probation; Inaba Inosuke received two years of probation, and prosecution for the remaining arrested members was cancelled.[2] Judging from these court decisions, we can assume that, except for Toda, Yajima, and Inaba, the other members abandoned their stand.

According to books published by Sōka Gakkai, life in prison was miserable for Makiguchi. They report there was no heating in the cell; meals were of cooked grains such as foxtail, millet, corn, and kaoliang, and the soy-bean-paste soup was like salt water; taking a bath was allowed only once a week.[3] However, this is not true. This explanation by Sōka Gakkai about

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 231-234.

[2]Murakami, Sōka Gakkai: Kōmeitō, p. 113.

[3]Uefuji and Oono, Kakumei no Taiga, p. 57.

his life in prison was only to emphasize the persecution that Makiguchi had to endure. Letters sent to his family tell that he could rent heating equipment at a low price.[1] Concerning meals, he was limited to wheat and corn, but he ate hot meals with a large bowl of soup three times a day.[2] He could get a special dish by paying extra, and he ate this special dish once a day.[3] His family was allowed to send him money freely and they did so. During the three days of the New Year celebration, rice cakes and special New Year dishes were served.[4] He was allowed to take a bath only once a week, and he could have his hair cut at low cost.[5] Things sent to a prisoner were examined thoroughly but almost anything was allowed. Makiguchi received clothes, underwear, blankets, medicine, and books. Letters were naturally examined, but he could write a letter once every ten days, and his family could send him letters freely. Makiguchi read Nichiren's works and did chanting in the morning and in the evening. Besides Nichiren's works, he also read the works of Kant.[6] He could borrow books in prison, and his pastime was reading.

> I am very happy now in prison because I can read many books which I have wanted to read since my younger days.[7]

---

[1] Makiguchi, "Shokan," p. 561.

[2] Ibid., pp. 564-565.

[3] Ibid., p. 558.

[4] Ibid., p. 562.

[5] Ibid., p. 561.

[6] Ibid., p. 572.

[7] Ibid., p. 565.

> My life here is like a single man's life in a three-mat room in an apartment.[1]

Makiguchi often asked his family to send him light reading such as Chūshingura (a story of a vendetta of retainers of a samurai clan). He wrote about his happy feelings when he received such books.[2]

At the same time, life in prison must have been inconvenient and hard for Makiguchi who was more than seventy years old then. It is possible that Makiguchi did not write about any difficulty in prison in view of censorship. However, because of the war, life for the majority of the Japanese people was hard and food was scarce. Therefore, it does not seem that Makiguchi's life in prison was unbearably hard as claimed by Sōka Gakkai today. Examination by prosecutors and judges was not the kind of examination which neglected human rights. Makiguchi stated that his relation with prosecutors and judges was close and warm.[3] The attitude of prosecutors and judges was friendly to Makiguchi because Makiguchi was an old man and because he was not basically critical about the Emperor system and state power in those days.

> I intend to obey any orders of the nation so that my relation with the prosecutors is a good one.[4]

> I intend to obey any laws of the nation so that you do not have to worry about me.[5]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 558.

[2] Ibid., p. 560, p. 561, p. 563.

[3] Ibid., p. 558, pp. 565-567.

[4] Ibid., p. 565.

[5] Ibid.

On October 13, 1944 Makiguchi heard from his family about his third son's death in the war. He said, "I was surprised at the news and disappointed." Makiguchi lost all four of his sons.[1] In spite of his sadness, he wrote as follows in a letter to his family.

> Our son died not because of some sickness, but he died in the war for the nation of the Emperor. His death is an honor. Let's pray for our son's happiness in the other world. This kind of faith is most important for us now.[2]

One month later, on November 18, 1944, Makiguchi died from old age and malnutrition at the age of seventy-three. It was one year and four months after he was put in jail.

(2) Makiguchi's Understanding of the Ideology of Emperor System

According to the materials of Makiguchi's examination by the Special High Police and his letters sent from prison, he asserted the absoluteness of the Lotus Sutra by using Nichiren as the prototype. In this respect, it seems that his thought had the universal element transcending the ideology of Emperor system of those days. However, his criticism of the Meiji government did not go any further than to criticize the fact that the government was forcing the people to worship at shrines; and because of this, Makiguchi's thought could not exist in the framework of the fascist government of those days. If the government had carried out its imperialist policies, including invasion

---

[1]He had four daughters, and the fourth one died in 1932 when she was fourteen years old.

[2]Makiguchi, "Shokan," p. 572.

policies of foreign nations, by emphasizing only the Emperor worship without forcing the people to worship at shrines, could Makiguchi have criticized this government policy, and could he have transcended the ideology of Emperor system? It is doubtful that he could. In order to respond to this question more clearly, I should like to study how Makiguchi accepted the Meiji government based on the Emperor system and its policies.

The Emperor system, as the ideology of the Meiji government to control the people, was completed by 1890. After the Meiji Restoration in 1868 to 1890 followed the period when the nation was looking for a new national system in place of the feudal system. The promulgation of the Constitution of the Imperial Nation of Japan in 1889 and the promulgation of the Imperial Rescript on Education in 1890 best symbolize the completion of the ideology of Emperor system.[1] The Constitution of the Imperial Nation of Japan starts with statements about the sovereignty and sacredness of the Emperor.

> Article 1) The Imperial Nation of Japan is ruled by an unbroken line of Emperors.
> Article 3) The Emperor is sacred and inviolable.[2]

The Imperial Rescript on Education shows the relationship between the Emperor as the sovereign and the people as his subjects. It states that loyalty to the Emperor and filial piety to parents

---

[1] Ishida Takeshi, Kindai Nihon Seiji Kōzō no Kenkyū [The Study of the Structure of the Politics of Modern Japan] (Tokyo: Mirai-sha, 1974), p. 12.

[2] Tamaru Tokuzen, Muraoka Kū, and Miyata Noboru, ed., Kindai Nihon Shūkyō-shi Shiryō [Source Book of History of Religions of Modern Japan] (Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppan-sha, 1973), p. 115.

are the necessary morals of the people, and it further states that it is the people's responsibility to fight for the Emperor when it is necessary.[1] In order to strengthen the people's loyalty to the Emperor, the Meiji government educated the people to its "ideology of the nation as a family." According to this ideology, the nation of Japan is one big family, the Emperor is the head family, and the people are the branch families or the children of the Emperor. The Meiji government tried to relate the people's love of their own families to their loyalty to the nation by using the Japanese people's traditional, irrational feeling of Emperor worship. The moral textbooks, revised and provided by the government in 1908, state this ideology as follows:

> Children's love for their parents is a natural feeling. Loyalty and filial piety are also natural feelings like children's love for their parents. . . . The foundation of our nation is the family system. The nation itself is one family, and the Imperial family is the head family. We, the people of this nation, love and respect the Emperor of the unbroken line of sovereigns with the same feeling children have for their parents. In this way, loyalty and filial piety are one thing. . . . The oneness of loyalty and filial piety is a characteristic of our national structure.[2]

Makiguchi positively accepted the ideology of the Emperor system which supported the Meiji government as stated above. Makiguchi considered the sovereignty of the Emperor and the ideology of the nation as a family with the Emperor at its center, not as the subject of his study or that of his criticism, but as

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 115-116.

[2] Ishida, Kindai Nihon Seiji Kōzō, p. 23.

truth without doubt. Makiguchi's interest in the Emperor and the ideology of the nation as a family was from the standpoint of pedagogy only; that is, how to make his students understand this truth.

> We should be very careful when we help students understand the power of the head of a family through their experiences. This is an important, fundamental concept for them in understanding the history of Japan. . . . We should show how the head of a family obtained that power, and show what a great responsibility he has to unify his family. Also, we should show that a family can exist only when all members obey the orders of the head of the family. This fundamental concept is necessary to understand the Emperor.[1]

In the chapter on nation in Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin to shite no Kyōdoka Kenkyū published in 1912, Makiguchi stated that the nation and the Emperor are one and the same, and that to be loyal to the Emperor is to love the nation.[2] This idea of Makiguchi's is the central theme of the ideology of the Emperor system of the Meiji government. In those days there was controversy among the scholars of constitutions on the subject of whether or not the Emperor, or the nation, has the sovereignty. Makiguchi indirectly criticized Minobe Tatsukichi who said that the nation has the sovereignty and that the Emperor is only the highest organ of the nation.

> To understand that the Emperor and the nation are one and the same is fundamental to true loyalty to the Emperor and true love for the nation. The utilitarian point of view that separates the Emperor and the nation is superficial and harmful.[3]

---

[1] Makiguchi, "Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin," p. 336.

[2] Ibid., p. 390.

[3] Ibid., p. 391.

Makiguchi's understanding of the Emperor and the nation is exactly the same as the ideology of the Emperor system of the Meiji government. Furthermore, his respect for the Emperor is not simply his understanding of the Emperor but his feeling of love for the Emperor. This feeling did not change after he converted to Nichiren Shōshū. For Makiguchi, the propaganda of the teachings of the Lotus Sutra was for the nation, which was, in other words, for the Emperor.

> We should convert as many people as possible to Nichiren Shōshū for the Emperor.[1]

Makiguchi's deep attachment to the Emperor and to the nation did not change even after he was persecuted by the government. Concerning the suppression of the organ, Kachi Sōzō, he stated in its last issue:

> It is very regretful that this organ cannot be continued. Being different from individualism or vain totalism, the true teachings of Buddhism and the Lotus Sutra are the way of major-good life based on the true totalism and the Japanese traditional spirit. I believed that I could prove in this organ that this is identical with the new national policy. However, unfortunately, the government misunderstood our intention.[2]

The "new national policy" in the above quotation was the fascist system based on the national mobilization. Even though the nation was under a fascist system, Makiguchi did not lose his deep attachment to the Emperor and the nation that carried out such a system. The only thing that Makiguchi was dissatisfied

---

[1]Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, "Mokuteki-kan no Kakuritsu" [Establishment of the View of Purpose], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū, vol. 5, p. 531.

[2]Kumagai, Makiguchi, p. 113.

with concerning the Emperor and the nation was that the Lotus Sutra was not approved as the national religion. Even after he was put in prison, he sent a letter to his family writing, "let's have a great hope and take care of ourselves because we belong to the Emperor."[1]

I pointed out earlier that Makiguchi spoke about the way of major-good life frequently. The way of major-good life for Makiguchi was to obtain not only the goodness of a small unit of the society, such as family or individual, but also the goodness of the society on a large scale. Makiguchi thought that loyalty to the Emperor and love of the nation are the major-good life. He chose four people as the performers of the major-good life in Japanese history: Wakeno Kiyomaro, Sugawara Michizana, Kusunoki Masashige, and Tokugawa Mitsukuni.[2] These historical figures, appearing in school textbooks as heroes, were worshippers of the Imperial family. These textbooks for teaching morality (shūshin) were authorized by the government and were for the purpose of control and propagation of the Emperor system. In order to become performers of major-good life like these historical men, Makiguchi believed that faith in the Lotus Sutra was not only effective but absolutely necessary.[3]

Makiguchi accepted the Meiji government policies for religions as they were. As stated earlier, Makiguchi classified

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Shokan," p. 557.

[2]Makiguchi, "Hokekyō no Shinja," p. 518.

[3]Makiguchi, "Shin Taisei no Risō," p. 528.

Shintoism not in the category of religion but in the category of social studies in Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin to shite no Kyōdoka Kenkyū.[1] The government policies dealing with religion were to organize all the shrines in Japan in a hierarchy by placing the Ise Shrine dedicated to Amaterasu Ōmikami, the ancestor of the Emperor, at the top of the hierarchy, and to penetrate the ideology of the nation as a family among the people. Makiguchi accepted such government policies not simply as policies but as the fact.

> How can we understand Amaterasu Ōmikami without understanding the Emperor today? How can each student understand the ancestor of the Emperor (Amaterasu Ōmikami) without understanding the ancestors of his family? We cannot understand the Ise Shrine if we do not understand our tutelary deity with our experiences.[2]

As is clear by now, Makiguchi almost completely agreed with the ideology of the Emperor system. There is a certain part in the ideology of the Emperor system that he did not completely agree with. It was his thought of the major-good life: Makiguchi's totalism was the way of life by which all the individuals and societies could reach the perfect happiness.[3] However, I think this was a statement of his idealism. He did not place the individual's happiness prior to the happiness of society or the nation; therefore, he did not totally criticize the ideology of Emperor system.

Nichiren criticized the nation by absolutizing the Lotus

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin," p. 397.

[2]Ibid., pp. 32-33.

[3]Makiguchi, "Taizen Seikatsu-hō sunawachi," p. 535.

Sutra. He predicted the destruction of the nation which rejected the Lotus Sutra; believing this, Nichiren retreated to Mt. Minobu. On the other hand, Makiguchi wanted the government and the Emperor to accept the Lotus Sutra, but he did not criticize the ideology of the Emperor system even after his thought was rejected, and even after he was oppressed by the government.

(3) Makiguchi's Understanding of Imperialistic Policies

Japanese modernization was based on the ideology of the absoluteness of the Emperor and the ideology of the nation as a family. Such modernization was realized by the enactment of the Maintenance of the Public Order Act, the control of the people's ideology by a strong police force, policies for building the wealth and military strength of the nation, and the imperialist invasion of Asian nations. Then, what kind of attitude did Makiguchi take to the imperialist policies of the Meiji government? As stated earlier, Makiguchi realistically considered world control by the imperialist nations as a fact and as historically inevitable.[1] Makiguchi accepted the conflicts among the imperialist nations as a natural fact of struggle for existence.

> Because of the increase of population, struggle for existence inevitably arises. The problems of colonies and immigration are also inevitable. Recently the strong nations of the West are trying to invade other nations, which is also inevitable.[2]

---

[1] See p. 28 above.

[2] Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (1)," p. 55.

Makiguchi not only accepted such invasion of imperialist nations by the West as an inevitable situation in history but also asserted that Japan should win this struggle for existence.

> Unless we proceed, we have to retreat. Unless we do it before others do, we will have no chance. These sayings describe the present situation of Japan clearly.[1]

The ideas of Makiguchi are exactly the same as the government policies for securing the wealth and military strength of the nation. Makiguchi considered that all industries should be developed in competition with the imperialist nations in the West.

> Merchants are infantrymen in the war, while merchandise are the bullets. Workers in factories are artillerymen, while factories are cannons. Farmers supply food to the military. The transportation systems are for sending weapons, bullets, and food. The present government is the top headquarters.[2]

Makiguchi thought that Japan's victory in competition with the imperialist nations was the most important thing for the happiness of the Japanese people in the future. Therefore, he thought that he could not say anything about the government spending most of the taxes for this purpose.[3]

Makiguchi positively supported Japan's imperialistic invasion of other nations.

> I am one of the many people who agree with the policy of colonization as a solution to the problem of population increase. However, regretfully Japan is behind other strong nations in the world because Japan did not open its doors to the world until recently. Therefore, most of the places on the earth were already colonized or occupied by

---

[1]Ibid., p. 91.

[2]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," pp. 516-517.

[3]Ibid., p. 396.

> the imperialists of the West so that the remaining places are the frigid zones or the barren areas and they are not adequate for people to live in.[1]

Makiguchi referred to the South Sea Islands as the "good colonies for the future of the Japanese people." He thought that China was the only place that the strong nations of the West had not touched yet. Therefore, his idea was that Japan should not be behind in the invasion of China.[2] Completely unrelated to Marxist theories, Makiguchi considered imperialism as inevitable in history. He thought that after the imperialistic invasion, Japan should change the people of the invaded nation to Japanese, and that such control by invasion would create several strong nations in the world which could coexist peacefully. Makiguchi had neither compassion for the people of the colonies nor did he think about their true happiness. We should realize that Makiguchi had a superiority complex toward the under-developed nations and an inferiority complex toward the strong nations of the West. In this connection he wrote:

> Westerners might think that the Japanese people look strange. . . . Two large races, the Westerners and the Japanese, in the world are now trying in invade the Chinese people who are also of the yellow race like Japanese. . . . However, this invasion means that the two imperialist races in the West and in the East are cooperating with each other to create peace in this world.[3]

The present Sōka Gakkai intentionally tries to conceal Makiguchi's positive acceptance of the imperialistic invasion.

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (1)," p. 290.

[2]Ibid., p. 81, p. 291.

[3]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 211.

In reality, most members of Sōka Gakkai understand Makiguchi from books written about him by Sōka Gakkai members, without reading Makiguchi's original works. Following is an example of the extreme kind of distortion found in these writings.

> Japan's political situation was too far from Makiguchi's ideal. The strong, imperialist nations of the West were strengthening their military forces and expanding their colonies by military power. Japan was trying to become one such strong nation. Makiguchi was critical about such an attitude of the Japanese government. He thought that the competition of military expansion would bring great confusion and destruction.[1]

In conclusion, viewing Makiguchi's thought, we see that he could not transcend the particularistic element, that is, the Emperor system and the imperialist policies. However, when we follow the change of his thought closely, we can say that he had certain elements which could transcend the ideology of Emperor system. They were his idea to value highly the happiness of common people, his positivistic, inductive methodology, and his faith in the Lotus Sutra. To die for the Emperor has an element of contradiction when considering the pursuit of happiness of the common people. The positivistic, inductive methodology has in it the elements needed to demythologize the political mythology of a fascist nation. Faith in the Lotus Sutra has in it the elements to contradict the deification of the Emperor.

Why, then, couldn't Makiguchi transcend the ideology of the Emperor system? As a clue to answer this question, I should like to introduce the thought of Yanagita Kunio. Yanagita was born three years later than Makiguchi, and met Makiguchi through

---

[1]Kumagai, Makiguchi, p. 155.

the Society of Places of Origin. They both had the same purpose of study, methodology, and academic interest. However, in Yanagita's thought we can find the universal element which transcends the ideology of the Emperor system. Although he had the common people's religion as the central theme of study, Yanagita did not have a religion of his own. In spite of this, Yanagita had the universal element, the thought to transcend the age. On the other hand, even though Makiguchi had a strong faith in the Lotus Sutra, which seems universal, he could not transcend the age. What is the reason for this difference? I believe that a comparative study of thought between Yanagita and Makiguchi is a good way for us to consider what a truly meaningful thought or religion is that has both the particularistic and universal elements.

C. YANAGITA KUNIO'S THOUGHT

(1) Background of Yanagita

Yanagita Kunio was born in 1875 in a small village in the western part of Japan. His father, Matsuoka Yakusai, was a physician.[1] Being a physician, his father studied the Chinese classics and the kokugaku of Hirata Atsutane in addition to medical science, as many doctors did in those days. Kokugaku (national study) is a nationalistic ideology, based on the myth of Kojiki (Record of Ancient Matters) and Nihonshoki (Chronicles of Japan), during the Tokugawa Era. After the Meiji Restoration, Yakusai

[1]Kunio married Yanagita Taka and took her family name, Yanagita.

relinquished his medical practice and became a Shinto priest. Yanagita was the fifth of eight children. Three died very early. Kunio's oldest and second oldest brothers became doctors. Michiyasu, his second oldest brother, was also a talented poet and a good friend of Mori Ōgai, one of the greatest novelists in the Meiji Era. Shizuo, his next younger brother, became a naval man, but in his later days was interested in linguistics and made a study of the various people of the South Sea Islands about which he wrote many books. Teruo, Kunio's youngest brother, was a painter.

As is shown in the paths that his brothers chose, Yanagita's home, as that of a physician, placed great value on science and at the same time was full of artistic sensitivity and understanding of classics through Japanese and Chinese classics, the art of poetry, especially "waka" or Japanese poetry. Such a home environment greatly influenced the formation of his character and in turn determined his attitude toward his study and methodology. Yanagita lived with his parents until he was thirteen years old. During that period, he read in a desultory way Japanese and Chinese classics which he found at a wealthy farmer's house near his home. At the age of thirteen, he was placed under the care of his two elder brothers who were living on the outskirts of Tokyo. He went to junior high school from there, but for some reason he changed from school to school. Therefore, he could not lead an ordinary student life. Even so, he spent much of his time reading the Japanese and Chinese classics, the literature of modern Japan and of the West with incredible speed.

After graduating from Daiichi Kōtōgakkō, he studied at the Tokyo Imperial University, the predecessor of the present Tokyo University. Since his high-school days, he had, through his brother Michiyasu, become acquainted with many literary men, such as Mori Ōgai. In this period, he started writing lyrics and prose. His works were published in Bungakkai (the Literary World), the leading magazine on the Japanese literature in those days. The central themes of his works were love, death, and nature, all permeated with romanticism. In many of his works were mingled the aroma of the Japanese classics, especially the literature of the medieval dynastic period, as well as the characteristics of naturalistic romanticism, similar to that of Wordsworth.[1] This shows the reflection of the tendency of his reading.

In his high-school and college days, he read much more Western literature and read it faster than any other literary men in Japan of those days. Masamune Hakuchō, a literary man about the same age as Yanagita, reminisced that he had been advised to read the works of Alphonse Daudet, Maupassant, and so forth by Yanagita who had just graduated from the university. According to Masamune, Yanagita was a founder of the Ibsen Association of Japan.[2] He took great interest in the sufferings and struggles

---

[1]Nakamura Akira, Shinpan: Yanagita Kunio no Shisō [Thought of Yanagita Kunio, New Edition] (Tokyo: Hōsei Daigaku Shuppan-kyoku, 1974), pp. 115-116; and Hashikawa Bunzō, "Yanagita Kunio," in Hito to Shisō: Yanagita Kunio [Personality and Thought: Yanagita Kunio], ed. Gotō Sōichirō (Tokyo: San'itsu Shobō, 1973), p. 262.

[2]Masamune Hakuchō, Kaisō [Retrospection], Masamune Hakuchō

of the people at the time of change from the native faith of north Europe to Christianity as described in Ibsen's Viking.[1] A literary man of West Europe to whom Yanagita was very strongly attracted was Anatole France. Yanagita had two sets of the complete works of France both in English and in French, which he read over and over with pleasure. France, who wrote a preface to the French version of James Frazer's Golden Bough, was on friendly terms with Frazer, and strongly interested in ethnology.[2] Yanagita showed an interest in France because he described the culture of pre-Christianity which was still existing in Western Europe.[3] For the same reason, he was attracted to Götter in Exil written by Heinrich Heine.[4] He also read the works of ethnologists, such as Edward Taylor, James Frazer, and so forth. However, this was after he studied Western literature and after he started his study of folklore.[5]

Zenshū [Collection of Masamune Hakuchō's Works], vol. 12 (Tokyo: Shinchō-sha, 1966), p. 410.

[1]Yanagita Kunio, "Ipusen Zakkan" [My Impressions on Ibsen], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 31 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1964), pp. 347-348.

[2]Nakamura, Shinpan: Yanagita Kunio, p. 14.

[3]Yanagita Kunio, "Nihon no Minzokugaku" [Study of Japanese Folklore], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 25 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1964), p. 253.

[4]Yanagita Kunio, "Fukō naru Geijutsu" [Unfortunate Art], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 7 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1962), p. 244.

[5]See Yanagita Kunio, "Ethnology towa Nani ka?" [What is Ethnology?], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 25, pp. 232-247. In this essay he writes about the situation of ethnology of those days in England and France.

His reading of Western literature in his high-school and college days had a great influence upon his study. Most of the literary men in the Meiji Era, including his friends Shimazaki Tōson and Kunikita Doppo, were emotionally attracted by Christianity, but Yanagita was different. He adopted Western culture through Western literature, but he knew, through his reading, about the existence of the non-Christian culture remaining in western Europe. Therefore, for Yanagita, Western culture is not equal to Christian culture. He wrote in his autobiography that he had emotionally approached Christianity only once in his whole life. When he was a university student, far away from home, he became so lonesome that he went to church near his boarding house. At that time he was attracted by the fine personality of a Canadian missionary of that church.[1] The motivation and the process of his approach to Christianity were the same as those students in the cities who approached Christianity in those days. However, since Yanagita had ideological strength like Mori Ōgai, he did not become a Christian even though he adopted Western culture. Yanagita said, "The life pattern of Japanese Christians did not suit mine. The Christians in Tokyo at that time were the westernized and new type of people."[2]

His ideological position was mainly influenced by the kokugaku which he learned from his father. His father, a scholar

---

[1]Yanagita, "Kokyō 70-nen," p. 448.

[2]Yanagita Kunio, "Watakushi no Tetsugaku: Mura no Shinkō" [My Philosophy: Faith of Villages], Dentō to Gendai, no. 34 (July 1975), p. 153.

of the kokugaku, followed in the wake of Hirata Atsutane and became a Shinto priest after the restoration. Yanagita criticized Hirata's kokugaku claiming that Hirata neglected popular belief by finding importances only in the classics and by not understanding the real faith of the Japanese people.[1] Yanagita stated that from his childhood, his father taught him that "foreignism" (Confucianism and Buddhism, totsukuni-buri) and "later-age manners" (thought after Buddhism came to Japan, nochinoyo-buri) should always be corrected. Yanagita tried to set great value on the original faith and feelings of the Japanese people by excluding those ideas which came into Japan from foreign nations later on, such as Buddhistic or Confucian ideas. It seems that the influence of his study of the kokugaku penetrated into his ideas unconsciously.[2]

(2) Object and Method of Yanagita's Study

Yanagita studied agricultural administration in university. He majored in this subject not simply because of scholarly interest. Studying Yanagita's ideas, Nakamura Akira states:

> It is impossible to understand thoroughly Yanagita's science of folklore only by touching the surrounding superficial parts. It is necessary to think from within by going deeply into his intention of posing the problems and his process of thinking.

Nakamura's attitude is especially important when studying Yanagita,

---

[1]Yanagita Kunio, "Shintō Shiken" [My Understanding of Shintoism], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 10 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1962), p. 438.

[2]Ibid., p. 440.

[3]Nakamura, Shinpan: Yanagita Kunio, pp. 3-4.

because the motivation of his study is one of the characteristics of his study. Comparing Yanagita's motivation with that of Western studies, Tsurumi Kazuko characterizes the former as having a clear purpose and motivation, in other words, the former is done in order to realize a clear value as a premise, while in the latter maintaining neutrality toward the value is to ensure the objectivity of the theory.[1] Yanagita's motivation in studying agricultural administration was to solve the problems of poverty and the resultant suffering of the Japanese people, the majority of whom were farmers.[2] He kept this motivation consistently even after he changed the course of his study from agricultural administration to folklore.

> Science should be integrated. It should contribute to the completion of humanity at the final stage. Each science isolated into its own sphere is nothing but a temporary pattern of division. Many of today's scholars forget this.[3]

After he began studying folklore, his motivation was deepened and strengthened more than before. In other words, at that stage of his life when he was studying agricultural administration, social reform was his purpose. On the other hand, the study of

---

[1]Tsurumi Kazuko, "Shakai Hendō no Paradaimu: Yanagita Kunio no Shigoto o Jiku to shite" [A Paradigm of Social Change: The Work of Yanagita Kunio as an Axis], in Shisō no Bōken [Adventure of Thought], ed. Tsurumi Kazuko and Ichikawa Saburō (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1974), p. 148; and Tsurumi Kazuko, "Yanagita Kunio's Works as a Model of Endogenous Development," Japan Quarterly, vol. 21, no. 3 (July-September 1975), pp. 224-225.

[2]Yanagita Kunio, "Arata naru Kokugaku" [New National Studies], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 25, p. 327.

[3]Yanagita Kunio, "Minkan Denshō-ron" [Popular Tradition], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 25, p. 335.

folklore gives guidance to people to help them think and act by themselves in order to solve their own problems of poverty and the suffering it produces.

Such a motivation of his was produced by his sympathy toward the people in poverty and suffering which he had felt with keen sensitivity in his childhood. He had experienced famine when he was young; however, he did not suffer starvation as many did, but he himself saw many such people. In his autobiography he wrote, "I still remember that I shivered with fear" when he saw a votive picture (ema) of a mother immediately after childbirth trying to kill her baby at a shrine of a guardian deity of children, near his brother's house.[1] Also, he often saw some mothers coming to his brother, a doctor, to ask him to write a death certificate for their children whom they killed rather than letting them die because of lack of food.[2]

After graduating from university, he worked at the Ministry of Agriculture and Commerce where he was in charge of agricultural administration. He had been a progressive bureaucrat and a scholar of agricultural administration for a period of ten years after 1901. During that period, he wrote thirteen important papers, and especially his opinions on farmers' unions and cash payment of farm rent were very advanced.[3] Tōhata Seiichi,

---

[1]Yanagita, "Kokyō 70-nen," p. 21. An ema is a votive picture drawn on a wooden tablet and dedicated to a shrine or a temple with prayer.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Tsunazawa Mitsuaki, Kindai Nihon no Dochaku Shisō: Nōhon-shugi no Kenkyū [Indigenous Thought of Modern Japan: Study of Physiocracy] (Nagoya: Fūbai-sha, 1969), pp. 147-164.

also a scholar of agricultural administration, wrote in his article review on Yanagita's "Jidai to Nosei (The Age and Agricultural Administration) as follows:

> This book was so advanced for the period that it could not evoke a public response. However, when the time came that people understood this, his work had already become a classic and could not directly lead the period.[1]

After the Russo-Japanese War, the leaders of the government held to the concept of physiocracy, placing especial value on agriculture, in which the cultivation of rice was made the central national industry, and regarding the farm villages as the source of national defense. Yanagita's study of agricultural administration did not touch at all upon such a tendency as the physiocracy of those days but he considered the improvement in the life of tenants and small-scale farmers as the goal of agricultural administration. As the means of attaining this goal, he rejected Ninomiya Sontoku's moralistic agricultural administration which was still powerful at that time. Instead, he made the scientific observation and analysis of actual society the foundation of his study.[2]

It is not clear why Yanagita abandoned the study of agricultural administration and started the study of folklore. However, as Tōhata says, it seems that he did so because his opinion was not accepted and because he was disappointed in the fact that not only the study of agricultural administration but

---

[1]Tōhata Seiichi, "Nōsei Gakusha to shite no Yanagita Kunio" [Yanagita Kunio, as a Scholar of Agricultural Policy], Bungaku, vol. 29, no. 1 (January 1961), p. 44.

[2]Hashikawa, "Yanagita Kunio," pp. 277-279.

also the politics of those days were undertaken for the interests of a party or a faction.[1] As a bureaucrat, he was successful and became chief secretary of the Upper House. The bureaucrats of those days were different from the ones of today, because they were regarded as people of the priviledged classes and in fact there were many bureaucrats who became members of the peerage.[2] Yanagita started his study motivated by sympathy toward the Japanese public and concern for their salvation and he remained loyal to this motivation to the end. However, he always was aware of the bureaucrat elite of those days.[3]

The object of his study of folklore was life, the way of thinking and the feelings of the Japanese people. Yanagita intended that his study would become a clue for the Japanese people to reflect upon themselves, to know themselves, and to become happier than ever before.[4] He studied popular tradition, that is, the past kept by the Japanese people, whose purpose was to find the right answer to the various problems which the people are facing now. In this sense, his study of folklore is a historical science.[5]

With the above-mentioned motivation, he tried to study the true nature of the Japanese people, past and present. For

---

[1]Yanagita, "Watakushi no Tetsugaku," pp. 150-151.

[2]Nakamura, Shinpan: Yanagita Kunio, p. 153.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Yanagita, "Minkan Densho-ron," pp. 337.

[5]Hashikawa, "Yanagita Kunio," p. 313.

him, the past and the present continue. Most of the European conceptions of history in the economic structure are conceptions of the developmental stage. In other words, the ideal pattern of the Western historical conception is to neglect the preceeding stage and to establish a structure which characterizes the next stage. Also the ideal pattern is that a spiritual structure corresponding to each stage appears because the spiritual structure of the preceeding stage has been neglected. On the other hand, Yanagita's historical conception sets value on continuation in history. He thinks that in Japan, not only in the social but also in the spiritual structure, the division between the prehistorical, ancient, medieval, and modern ages is not clear. Today, the life customs and the spiritual structures of the prehistorical, ancient, and medieval ages coexist like a mosaic. Comparing this with the European historical concept of stages, Tsurumi Kazuko calls Yanagita's conception of history "an icicle model" of history.[1]

Yanagita pays attention to the "common man" (jōmin) as the subject which comprises the continuation in history. In other words, his study of folklore is nothing other than a study of common man. Gotō Sōichiro states:

> When we correctly understand Yanagita's idea of common man, we find Yanagita's greatness and at the same time discover

---

[1]Tsurumi, "Shakai Hendō no Paradaimu," p. 150; and Tsurumi, "Yanagita Kunio's Work," pp. 227-228. Ishida Eiichirō calls this as "extra-history." See Ishida Eiichirō, "Unfinished but Ending: Yanagita Kunio's Folklore Studies," Japan Quarterly, vol. 10, no. 1 (January-March 1963), p. 38.

> the deviation and pathology in our discernment of the subject creating history.[1]

When studying Yanagita, his concept of the common man becomes central. "Jōmin" is a word created by Yanagita. The word, jō, means continuity and the word, min, means the people. A word which has almost a similar meaning to Yanagita's jōmin is heimin (commoners). Yanagita also uses this word.[2] In his earlier works, he used the word, heimin. He started using the word, jōmin, after "Kyōdo Seikatsu no Kenkyū-hō" (Method of Studying the Life of Places of Origin) written from 1931 to 1933.[3] One of the reasons why he changed the term from heimin to jōmin is that since the word heimin had been colored by socialism he considered the situation of the nation becoming militaristic at that time.[4] Besides this reason, he did not like the fact that the word heimin was used by intellectual socialists. We should think that he created the new word jōmin to mean the common people, including even illiterates, who were the subject of his study.

Yanagita resented the fact that historians up until his

---

[1]Gotō Sōichiro, Yanagita Kunio-ron Josetsu [Introduction to the Study of Yanagita Kunio] (Tokyo: Dentō to Gendai-sha, 1972), p. 48.

[2]Yanagita Kunio, "Kyōdo Kenkyū towa Nani ka" [What is the Study of Places of Origin?], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 25, p. 264. The Meiji government changed the system of four classes--military, agricultural, artisan, and mercantile--which had existed before the Meiji Restoration, into two classes--nobility and commoners. Heimin is a legal term, but later on, at the time of the democratic-rights movement it was used as a political term representing a class.

[3]Gotō, Yanagita Kunio-ron Josetsu, p. 49.

[4]Ibid.

time had neglected the common man. Therefore, he tried to make the common man the central subject of history. It is not too much to say that this work constitutes the core of his study. In "Kyōdoshi-ron" (Study of Record of Places of Origin), Yanagita criticizes the historians while showing compassion toward the common people.

> I think that there never have been written any history of the common man in Japan. Not only in Japan but also in any other country in the world, a chronicle is only a record of certain incidents. The history which has been written up till now is largely a collection of incidents concerning the ruling class and the many heroes. It is true that politics and wars are the important things in history and that all people have been influenced by them. However, to ascertain the feelings of the people who participated in such wars only by reading articles about what happened is just like trying to understand the feelings of someone through a camera. . . . In Ehon Taikōki (Picture Book on Autobiography of Toyotomi Hideyoshi), we can find the frequently recurring marks "へ" behind horses and warlords. This mark represents the helmet of the common soldiers. Even though they are described as only common soldiers, they had their own families, worked as town headmen, took good care of other people, or in today's terminology, a Dietman. Such people were treated coldly in this way. . . . This kind of mistake is not only that of the author of this picture book, but also that of the concept of "tami" (common people) as used by historians.[1]

He moved from his position as an agricultural-administration bureaucrat to the Legislation Bureau. Since he had plenty of leisure time, he could make many trips and actually observed by himself almost all the villages of Japan and the people living there.[2] Yanagita's study covers the entire scope of the common man's life, behavior, and feelings. He classifies the popular

---

[1]Yanagita Kunio, "Kyōdo-shi-ron" [Study of Record of Places of Origin], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 25, pp. 9-10.

[2]Yanagita, "Watakushi no Tetsugaku," p. 150.

traditions of the common man into three categories: (1) tangible culture which includes housing, clothes, food, the way of acquiring the materials for living, transportation, labor, village, household, relatives, marriage, birth, calamities, funerals, regular yearly events, festivals, divination, incantations, dance, game, children's play, and toys; (2) linguistic arts which include the process of the creation of new words, resultant new words and phrases, proverbs, riddles, incantations, children's words, songs, narratives, old stories, and legends; and (3) mental phenomena which includes knowledge, the art of living, and the purpose of life.[1] Among these three, he found the most important to be the third category. The study of faith and the mind in the common man's life formed the center of his study, since for him the study of folklore was the study of the history of faith.[2]

In such a way Yanagita studied the common man's life in detail and wrote papers in every field. A collection of all of his works comprises thirty-one volumes, each of which has an average of 550 pages. From the historian's point of view, Ienaga Saburō classifies Yanagita's study into the following seven categories: (1) a history of Shintoism, or a history of Japanese religions, (2) a history of the Japanese literature, (3) a history of Japanese manners and customs, (4) a history of

---

[1]Hashikawa, "Yanagita Kunio," p. 305.

[2]Yanagita Kunio, "Shintō to Minzokugaku" [Shintoism and Study of Folklore], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 10, p. 326.

the Japanese language, (5) a history of the family system, (6) a history of thought, and (7) a history of architecture.[1]

Yanagita's faith in the potentiality of the common man creating history is clearly shown in his selection of the materials for the study of history and folklore. He rejected the attitude of historians who find their materials in literary documents. Instead, he studied the history of common man by regarding the illiterate common man's popular tradition as the only material.

> Our aim is to broaden our knowledge of human life by observing the old ways of life, the ways of work and thought, preserved among the people: that is, outside the intellectual class, and by means other than the written word.[2]

Here, we find that the "icicle model" of history becomes the premise for his study method. This is also clearly shown in his assertion concerning the materials for his study of the Japanese people's faith, which was the center of his study of folklore. He rejects the idea of confusing his study of folklore with any history of Shintoism. For him, Shintoism, as the native faith (koyū shinkō) of Japan, which the common people have kept from prehistoric times to the present, is not identical with the Shintoism presented by so-called Shinto theologians or historians. For him the history of this latter-type of Shintoism is a history of doctrines created by the intellectual of Shintoism and is different from the history of the native faith of the

---

[1]Ienaga Saburō, "Yanagita Shigaku-ron" [Yanagita's Study of History], in Hito to Shisō: Yanagita Kunio, ed. Gotō Sōichirō, pp. 144-145.

[2]Yanagita, "Minkan Denshō-ron," pp. 340-341.

Japanese common man.[1] While placing high value on Moto'ori Norinaga's view of the kokugaku, Yanagita criticized him concerning his selection of materials, saying, "It is very regretful that he spent his whole life only in the study of the classics."[2]

His firm and determined will to make the common man's popular tradition the only material for the study of the common man is, in other words, a strong criticism against intellectual historians and scholars of religions who have treated the common man coldly or neglected him. His criticism of ethnology proceeds from the same kind of consciousness of the problem. He wrote about the relation between his own study of folklore and ethnology in "Minkan Denshō-ron," which most clearly shows his methodology. He uses the word minkan densho, meaning popular tradition, which corresponds literally to the French les traditions populaires, in order to describe the study of what is known in English as folklore and in German as Volkskunde.[3] He clearly distinguishes the study of folklore from ethnology. He defines the latter as the study of the life of the other nations in a wide sense, while the former as the introspective study of oneself. Even though the study of folklore uses the same method as ethnology in observing the facts, the study of folklore can penetrate into the inner territory of mental phenomena, that is,

---

[1]Yanagita, "Shintō to Minzokugaku," p. 332.

[2]Yanagita Kunio, "Waga Kuni Kyōdo Kenkyū no Enkaku" [History of the Study of Places of Origin in Japan], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 25, p. 301.

[3]Yanagita, "Minkan Denshō-ron," pp. 340-341.

"something that is behind the facts" or the "power behind," which he thinks is the fundamental characteristic of the study of folklore.[1] Yanagita criticized the existing ethnology as follows:

> The documents of ethnology in the past were the tribute offered by faithful Christian missionaries for a long time. They learned native languages and kept the records of the feelings and the work of the mental capacity of the people in detail. . . . There was only one problem, that is, their preconceptions. These missionaries definitely believe in the absoluteness of their own religion. Moreover, they understood that the culture of each nation is located in some place in the process of an evolutionary path. . . . In the mission and education of the people, such an idea produced an unnatural and unfortunate interference and made the weak people suffer.[2]

Perhaps, ethnology in Yanagita's eyes lacked seriousness in the motivation of its study and despised the people and the culture of developing nations.

He delineated the problems of ethnology and the comparative study of religions from his own standpoint. However, his study of folklore is not a narrow-minded or nationalistic one confining itself only to the study of one nation's folklore or asserting its absolute correctness. He also opened himself to the comparative ethnology and the comparative study of religions. Hoping for the completion of the study of anthropos, Yanagita regards his study of folklore as a preparation for this:

> The prospects of the comparative study of folklore are not good. We are waiting desperately for the time when the final goal of this study will be reached, regarding this

---

[1]Hashikawa, "Yanagita Kunio," p. 303.

[2]Yanagita, "Nihon no Minzokugaku," p. 244.

> study as a study in which human beings reflect upon themselves and are even the ultimate object of our study.[1]
>
> We hope and believe that sometimes in the future the day will come when the past of many nations in the world who lack any documentary records will be clarified through our method of study and that such a past will also become the object of the study of world folklore.[2]

He insists that a true anthropology or the comparative study of folklore should be, in a strict sense, a science seriously motivated by the introspection of the human being. He criticizes European ethnology for being established on the dogma of natural science with the theory of evolution in its center. He thinks that in order to complete the true anthropology, first of all, the study of the folklore of each nation should be completed by scholars of that particular nation. He criticizes the easy way of universalization. He concentrates his energies on elucidating the real faith, the mind, and the feelings of the Japanese people, by going deeply into the study of Japanese folklore. He seems to have believed that when he was absorbed in an individual case, he could find the universal. Such an idea and methodology take a completely reverse approach from European ethnology which already has a universal conception of man and also of history, and then it tries to find proofs for such a conception in the culture of different nations.

His criticism of the dogma contained in the evolutionary

---

[1]Yanagita Kunio, "Hikaku Minzokugaku no Mondai" [Problems of Comparative Study of Folklore], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 30 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1964), p. 70.

[2]Yanagita Kunio, "Sho Gaikoku no Minzoku Kenkyū" [Studies of Folklore in Foreign Countries], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 25, p. 296.

study of folklore is one of the manifestation of his criticism of the deductive method of study. In his study of folklore and in that of religions, he insisted thoroughly upon the inductive and positivistic method and he himself carried it out. He tried his best to establish as a science his own study of folklore and of religion. For him, a science is nothing more than an inductive and positivistic method.

> A science should reach natural conclusions obtained from as many and as accurate facts as possible through the inductive method. The reason why social science is neglected in our country is because the self-styled social scientists are too often unscientific.[1]

Yanagita's thoroughly inductive and positivistic methodology, as well as his conception of the common man, is an important element.

One of the reasons why he insisted upon the inductive method and why he criticized the deductive method lies in the situation of the academic world of Japan at that time. In the Japan of his time, the debate on social reforms by the right and left wings was fierce. Especially, all the social sciences were under the influence of Marxism. It was the time when all the possibilities of social reforms were homogeneously evaluated by a deductive revolutionary theory. On the other hand, Yanagita became disgusted with the right-wingers' idea of the absoluteness of the Japanese spirit. In other words, he was angry at the unscientific stance of those people who asserted the importance of something Japanese but did not try to investigate what was truly Japanese.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 325.

In "Kyōdo Seikatsu no Kenkyū-hō," Yanagita criticizes the attitude of Japanese scholars and states that as scholars they should observe and study the facts with an honest and clear mind: "Some of the students of the history of culture today try to search for old things with a certain plan or a conviction already in mind."[1] Yanagita could not regard as a science any study that has a certain value or a strong conviction as a premise almost like a faith. It seems that his standpoint of studying the facts with an "honest mind" was influenced by his study of the kokugaku. This attitude of his is somewhat related to Moto'ori Norinaga's assertion concerning the importance of a "true heart" (magokoro) in the study: "If we want to know the human way (michi) through study, we should first of all get to the bottom of the Chinese mind (karagokoro). . . . Originally, the human way cannot be understood by the study but by the native 'true heart' itself which is the human way."[2] The kokugaku in his background, together with the situation of the Japanese academic world of those days, became the cause leading him to the thoroughly inductive method.

Yanagita's inductive and positivistic methodology is thoroughly carried out also in his study of religion. His study of folklore, as mentioned before, deals with the ultimate level of human feelings, so that naturally his study becomes a certain

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Moto'ori Norinaga, "Tamakatsuma" [Bamboo Fence], in Moto'ori Norinaga Zenshū [Collection of Moto'ori Norinaga's Works], vol. 1, ed. Ōno Susumu (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1968), p. 47.

sociology of religion. He studied complex faith, religious feelings, festivals, yearly events, ballads, and so forth among the Japanese common man. As the conclusion of the study, he says that the primitive pattern of the Japanese common man's religion is ancestor worship, that is, as the worship of the spirits of the ancestors. In view of the results, his study of religion represents a certain sociology of religion, a study of society related to ancestor worship. However, unlike Moto'ori Norinaga or Origuchi Shinobu who studied the same Japanese native faith, Yanagita did not personally embrace them, that is, he did not believe in ancestor worship or make it his own religion. Furthermore, he neither looked upon ancestor worship as absolute nor did he universalize it. His idea was that ancestor worship, as the native faith of the Japanese common man, is most natural for the Japanese people, and he justified the point that it gives the Japanese common man a sense of well-being. His standpoint is strictly inductive and positivistic in the methodology of his study and at the same time it is historical and relativistic in its judgment of thought and religion.

Then, what does Yanagita accept as religion for himself? He had contact with Christianity, Zen, and several other Buddhist sects, but among them all he felt himself closest to faith in the Merciful Bodhisattva (Kannon). He writes, "Once I hear that it is a temple dedicated to Kannon, I feel like I want to go inside."[1] Sako Jun'ichirō, a representative Christian literary man of con-

---

[1]Yanagita, "Watakushi no Tetsugaku," p. 154.

temporary Japan, talks about Yanagita from his personal experience of being his friend as follows: "I have never met a man in my life who thinks about the soul after death as seriously as Yanagita."[1] It can be said that his strong pursuit of the soul after death is more than simply a scholarly interest but is also an existential one.

"Senzo no Hanashi" (About Our Ancestors), a monument of Yanagita's study of Japanese religiosity, was written as a result of his urgent question of what will happen to the souls of many young people who died in World War II.[2] He wrote this article from April to the end of May of 1945, right before the end of the war, in the midst of daily air raid. Having a foreboding that the end of the war would come soon, he expressed his determination by thinking about the many young men who were in the battlefields in foreign countries. "This time we should think out a new social organization which does not become a victim of reactionaries and which is most well harmonized with the people's nature," he said.[3] With this determination, he tried to clarify Japanese religiosity in order to find a clue to answer the question of what the new post-war society should be like.

For Yanagita, ancestor worship, as the center of the

---

[1]Sako Jun'ichirō, "Ōinaru Isan" [Great Inheritance], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, Geppō [Collection of Yanagita Kunio's Works, Monthly Report], no. 16 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, September 1969), p. 8.

[2]Yanagita Kunio, "Senzo no Hanashi" [About Our Ancestors], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 10, pp. 151-152.

[3]Ibid., p. 4.

native religiosity of the Japanese people, is a peaceful and natural thing for them, being firmly related to the family system and to the community system. It seems that he strongly insists that his idea of ancestor worship is inconsistent with the conception of the nation as a family (kazoku kokka), which was the ideology supported by the absolute government of the Meiji Era. According to Yanagita, one of the important characteristics of Japanese religiosity is that the soul of the dead stays in the native land of Japan, especially in the mountains near the village communities, instead of returning to nothingness or going into the Pure Land. From there, the soul watches over the descendents' lives. Also the descendents welcome the souls of their ancestors, communicate with them, and return them to the place where they belong by carrying out various kinds of yearly religious events. Therefore, Yanagita says that ancestor worship is the recognition of the religious communion between the soul of ancestors and the descendents.[1] He not only recognizes ancestor worship as the result of his study of folklore, but feels kindly toward it, thinking that it is important and should not be lost.

> The thought that the soul, even after death, still remains in the land of the living makes me feel good, perhaps because I am a Japanese. If it is possible, I want to stay in this country forever and to watch from a small hill somewhere so that I can see one culture flourish a little bit more beautifully and my study contribute to society a little bit more.[2]

---

[1]Yanagita Kunio, "Tamashii no Yukue" [Where Does a Dead Soul Go?], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 15 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1963), pp. 560-561.

[2]Ibid., p. 561.

However, Yanagita does not embrace the ancestor worship of Japanese native religion as his own faith, even though he feels close to it himself. He explains the reason for this:

> I was not in such circumstance that I had to think about my happiness all the time. . . . I decided to study the native religion because when I wondered how people could live happily and quietly, I knew it was not only because of Buddhism.[1]

He left this world without any words concerning his own funeral. Even Shintoism as the native religion could not become his own. Sako Jun'ichirō wrote in one of his memoir about Yanagita that one time Yanagita told him: "I know where the soul is until forty days after death, but I do not know after that."[2] From the investigation of his study of folklore, Yanagita convinced himself where the soul is until forty days after death. However, an answer to the question of after forty days is unclear from his study. He does not dare assert what cannot be proved by the method of his study. From the point of Buddhism or Christianity, his standpoint on religion seems irreligious. Nakamura Akira states:

> Yanagita's standpoint is undoubtedly irreligious and scientific.[3]

> By limiting himself to the study of folklore, he escaped from the problems of philosophy and religion. He could not touch the problem of man's ultimate way of life which should be confronted in the dimension of thought.[4]

---

[1]Yanagita, "Watakushi no Tetsugaku," p. 154.

[2]Ibid., p. 155; and Sako, "Ōinaru Isan," p. 8.

[3]Nakamura, Shinpan: Yanagita Kunio, pp. 234-235.

[4]Ibid., p. 130.

However, this analysis and criticism is made from the European standpoint that the existential way of life is the most correct, the most serious, and the best. It is a deductive standpoint to apply this European yardstick to Yanagita, to the Japanese people, and to Eastern people, which Yanagita disliked most. His goal is the tranquility of his own mind and the happiness and tranquility of the people.[1] Even though he did not believe in any specific religion, he was a very religious man, as Sako said, for his life was spiritually very rich. Even if the problem is an ultimate one concerning his own existence, he neither determined nor asserted anything unless it was proved by his own method of study. I should like to support the analysis done by Hashikawa Bunzō that Yanagita's standpoint is "a spirit so free that we cannot imagine it."[2]

The last thing that characterizes his methodology is the analysis in his study made through his poetic intuition. He tried to make his study of folklore a science. In order to do this, he collected as many folklore materials as possible. By making an induction from these, he searched for the essence of the Japanese people, especially the religious consciousness of the Japanese common man. However, in the real work of induction, it is necessary to organize the materials and relate them to one another by a certain method because popular tradition as a material is very unorganized. He had enough students and staff mem-

---

[1]Yanagita, "Watakushi no Tetsugaku," pp. 155-156.

[2]Hashikawa, "Yanagita Kunio," p. 320.

bers to acquire new materials for his study throughout Japan. Yanagita instructed his staff and taught them the research method. Though he had his students help collect materials, he did not let them participate in the work of organizing them. He organized them and rounded off his researches with his own imaginative power. It was because Yanagita was too original and progressive, and too far ahead-of-time in terms of critical modern study of Japanese cultural history, that contemporary people could not have the same critical mind as he did. Ienaga Saburō, criticizing Yanagita's methodology, states that "it is an art rather than a science."

> In order to make his historical study both a science with an original methodology and to make it unique, he developed an efficiency in collecting materials in systematic collaboration with the students of the same field, which could not be found in other academic circles. However, in the final work of formulating the historical system and unifying the materials, he could not but depend on his own gifts. It is an art rather than a science, in the sense that the value of his study cannot be maintained if it is not his own.[1]

Even though Ienaga is criticizing Yanagita in this way, he admits that social science should rely on individual ability and personality to a certain degree. However, Ienaga thinks that Yanagita used too much of his individuality in his historical study.[2] Ienaga's analysis is much to the point, but his criticism is not clear. I think we should feel sorry about the fact that there are not many people who have Yanagita's personality or ability.

When Yanagita analyzed popular tradition, he set great

---

[1] Ienaga, "Yanagita Shigaku-ron," p. 160.

[2] Ibid.

value on sympathy and compassion toward the object of the study:

> It is important to try to look at the old days with the feeling for the time and for the situation of each case. In other words, this is compassion. This can be said not only in the case of studying the life of our ancestors, but also in studying different people at present. Students cannot understand a thing unless they renounce themselves.[1]

From this kind of subjective observations, Yanagita organized his materials of folklore. However, it is inappropriate to make the hasty conclusion that his study was the product of his own subjectivity. Nakamura Akira writes in one of his memoirs: Yanagita said that "a study should be something that springs out of oneself."[2] This is his methodology. Therefore, his analysis represents not simply a dogmatism or an idea that came up incidentally. His study is the result of his abundant reading, his knowledge of popular tradition, and his intuition that saw the essence and was trained by his rare and strong power of memory. Therefore, his analysis was made in terms of modern speculation. Especially when we realize that his study of folklore makes mental phenomena the first object of study, we realize that his intuitive power like that of poets is indispensable.

(3) Evaluation and Criticism

Now, I should like to study the problems and the values of Yanagita's study in the context of the time in which he was living and also the significance of this for the present time.

---

[1]Yanagita Kunio, "Nihon Nōmin-shi" [History of Japanese Farmers], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 16 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1962), p. 168.

[2]Nakamura, Shinpan: Yanagita Kunio, p. 117.

With respect to politics, Yanagita was a progressive conservative who tried to make improvements gradually by setting a great value upon tradition. After he stopped working for the government in 1920, he became an editor of the Asahi Newspaper and continued this work until 1930. This period in Japan was the time of militarism in which the nation was marching toward World War II. Yanagita's editorials during this time show how advanced his ideas were in those days. Criticizing Mussolini's fascism in Italy, he said, "Without any doubt, there is nothing we can learn from Italy. . . . Those who love their nation should not be so narrow-minded."[1] He asserted that the cabinet ministers of the army and the navy should be public officials and not military officers.[2] He opposed the control of ideology by the Maintenance of the Public Order Act.[3] He gave words of encouragement to the Labors' and Farmers' Party, a proletariat party which was suppressed on the day of its establishment by the Maintenance of the Public Order Act.[4] With respect to the Imperial Rescript on Education enacted by the Meiji leader in the name of Emperor, which became the criterion for education, ethics, and ideology in Japan, Yanagita complained: "We should not think that the Imperial Rescript on Education expresses Japanese morality com-

---

[1]Yanagita Kunio, "Asahi Shinbun Ronsetsu (1)" [Editorials of the Asahi], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 32 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1963), p. 103.

[2]Ibid., pp. 120-122.

[3]Yanagita Kunio, "Asahi Shinbun Ronsetsu (2)," in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 33 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1964) p. 122.

[4]Ibid., pp. 325-237.

pletely."[1] He criticized the Imperial Rescript for enforcing the ideology of the Emperor system based on Confucian ethics and for neglecting the popular morality which traditionally existed among the Japanese people. Because of this criticism, he was oppressed by right-wingers. This criticism arose from his finding great value in the common man. Thus, in those days, he took a liberal standpoint, but this does not mean that he was a progressive. He had great regard for tradition and thought that a gradual improvement of society and culture was necessary for the maintenance of tradition.

Yanagita criticized individual cases of totalitarian and militaristic policies based on the ideology of the Emperor system, as mentioned before. However, this criticism was not a serious one because it was not existential. In other words, there was a point beyond which he refused to go and therefore, never got into serious trouble because of his views. After he retired from the Asahi, he hardly made any statements on politics but devoted himself entirely to his study of folklore. Around this time, he started using the word, "jōmin," instead of "heimin."[2] He did not try to confront the rise of militarism in 1930's directly either in the political or the academic sense. The chief reason for this lies in his view of life or his sense of values. According to "Watakushi no Tetsugaku: Mura no Shinkō" which is his only philosophical work, we understand that his ultimate concern is

---

[1] Gotō, Yanagita Kunio-ron Josetsu, p. 42.

[2] See p. 177 above.

the daily happiness of the individual.[1] An individual for him is not a subjective person with his own will, but one who lives on the foundation provided by a group, called a family, which is connected to a small community. His standpoint is to see the greatest value in the happiness of the daily life of an individual. In Yanagita, we cannot find any ideological attempt to go beyond an assertion of the importance of daily happiness to any criticism of social and national oppression of individual happiness.

Yanagita's lack of criticism of the Emperor ideology of his day is often cited as one of his defects. As a bureaucrat under the Emperor system, he committed himself deeply to it. During his governmental career, he served as a secretary of the Imperial Household Agency for a while. When the Emperor Shōwa ascended to the Throne, Yanagita made a proposal to amend the daijōsai (coronation), the most religious and sacred ceremony of the Imperial Court.[2] The fact that he was in a position to be able to express his opinions on such a religious ceremony concerning the Emperor shows how priviledged he was as a result of his public career within the system itself. Because of the influence of his study of the kokugaku, he entertained friendly sentiments toward the Emperor beyond ideology.

> I do not want to make any statement on the Emperor system in distinct words, but to tell the truth that I have a

---

[1] Yanagita, "Watakushi no Tetsugaku," p. 153.

[2] Yanagita Kunio, "Daijōsai ni kansuru Shokan" [My Opinion on Daijosai], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 31, pp. 376-381.

> sense of loyalty to the Emperor. I think we should be loyal to the Emperor in any case. . . . The problem of the Emperor is almost the problem of the destiny of the Japanese people. It is the problem of religious feeling. Therefore, I think that it is not necessary to explain this problem logically.[1]

Yanagita's background in the kokugaku and his standpoint as a public servant under the Emperor system influenced his analysis of concrete cases in his study of folklore; for example, his analysis of the Ise Shrine--this shrine is consecrated to Amaterasu Ōmikami, a deity from which the Imperial Family is said to be descended. He considered the confrontation between Amatsukami (the gods of heaven) and Kunitsukami (the gods of the earth) in the myths of the Kojiki (Records of Ancient Matters) as a confrontation between conquerors from foreign lands who were the ancestors of the Imperial Family and the original inhabitants of the islands of Japan.

> The Kunitsukami of the pre-historic age were divided into two groups. The majority were assimilated in the villages with the tribe of the ancestors of the Imperial Family. The rest went in mountains and became known as "men of mountains" (sanjin)[2]

The confrontation between the conquering tribe from outside Japan and the original inhabitants represented a confrontation of differing faiths, in other words, a confrontation between polytheistic ancestor worship and worship of the universal sun god. However, from the fact that in the ceremonies of the Ise Shrine there is an indication of faith in the tutelary deity

---

[1]Yanagita, "Watakushi no Tetsugaku," pp. 161-162.

[2]Yanagita Kunio, "Sanjin Kō" [Study of Mountain People], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 4 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1963), p. 177.

(ujigami) of the priestly family of the shrine itself, Yanagita emphasized the continuity between the faith of Amaterasu Ōmikami--the ancestral deity of the Imperial family and the universal sun god--and the faith in the tutelary deity.[1] Such a tendency in his thinking reflects his attempt to consider the formation of the Japanese nation as the result of the fusion of many un-opposed and differing races without regarding the confrontation of rituals as a confrontation of tribes. Also it reflects his idea that the unity of the Japanese people with the Emperor at its center is not the result of political confrontation but rather a phenomenon created almost spontaneously.

He did not try to confront the absolutism with the Emperor at the center either consciously or emotionally. However, his attitude in his study and his fundamental standpoint of placing great value on the common man and the scientific method represented a criticism of the ideology of the Emperor system. This aspect of his study is also relevant to our criticisms of the present day. For example, as the result of his positivistic study of the common man's faith which is the central theme of his study of folklore, he finds only the ancestor worship of an individual family and the tutelary-deity worship of several families as a community. Nothing more comes out of his research. Therefore, his study was critical of the modern nation of Japan based on the Emperor system, which tried to unite the

---

[1]Yanagita Kunio, "Yamamiya Kō" [Study of Mountain Shrine], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 11 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1963), p. 318.

nation under national Shintoism with the Emperor at its center by using the common man's faith.[1] Therefore, he thought there was a difference between the Shintoism of Shinto theologians dealing with the myths of the Kojiki and the Nihonshoki as materials for their study, and that of Shintoism as the native faith of the common man since prehistoric times. He thought that the popular traditions themselves of the common man, rather than documentary records, represented the oldest and most veritable pictures of the common man. Therefore, he could not but stand against the national faith with the Emperor in its center based on the Kojiki and the Nihonshoki as the fundamental character of the country. In none of his works can we find a statement on the concept of the nation as a family which was one of the important ideologies of the Meiji Emperor system. Naturally this kind of idea did not come out of his positivistic study of the feelings of the common man. Also he strongly criticized the policy of the systematization of all shrines in Japan into one hierarchy and the amalgamation of small local shrines, which was carried out by the state for the purpose of establishing national Shintoism.[2] At the same time, he was critical about the government's making Shintoism a state religion. In order that the government's action would not be contrary to the freedom of religion guaranteed by the Constitution, the government presented the idea that Shintoism, being different from Christianity or

---

[1]Yanagita, "Senzo no Hanashi," p. 33.

[2]Ibid., p. 39.

Buddhism, was not a religion but expressed the patriotic feelings of the Japanese people and that all the Japanese should respect this. In this way, the government promoted the policy of controlling the people through national Shintoism. Yanagita criticized this policy saying that the relationship between the people and shrines is clearly a religious one.[1]

As mentioned before, Yanagita had a deep feeling for the Emperor as a result of his study of the kokugaku and he did not question the existence of the Emperor itself. On the other hand, his ultimate concern was to make the common man's life happy. Therefore, he was critical of the government policy of oppressing other ideologies and forcing the people into wars, which jeopardized his own ultimate concern. However, he did not state his own ideological position clearly or strongly enough to resist such government oppression. His standpoint was that the real improvement of society was impossible if the people did not try to improve their own society consciously by understanding their own traditions, using this as an opportunity to reflect upon themselves. Amidst the storm of militarism, Yanagita did not choose the way to thorough resistance, as Marxists and some religionists did. In other words, he concealed himself during the storm, waiting for it to pass, prepared to give clues to the people so that after the storm they would be able to choose the right way by themselves. Those who resisted thoroughly could transcend particularistic and militaristic nationalism by means

---

[1]Yanagita, "Shintō Shiken," pp. 431-432.

of a religious approach or by an universal ideology such as Marxism. Yanagita did not resist thoroughly as such people did. However, we should realize that his free spirit which was firmly based on the idea of the common man and upon his own reliance on science also had its universal elements which transcended much of this.

Yanagita was trying to find a way to overcome the various evils of the modernization of Japan. In doing so, his way of thinking was based upon the standpoint of common man, who should be the subject of modernization, and upon an immanent understanding of the life and spirit of the common man. In this respect, we should say that Yanagita through his study had been criticizing the evil of the Meiji government from the inside. In other words, we can say that "he tried to search for a principle which transcended the contradictions of the modern world and of the modernization in the people's life itself which had been overlooked by the state."[1]

D. Conclusion: Weakness of Makiguchi's Thought

There are several aspects which are common to both Makiguchi and Yanagita. First of all, they both had the same purpose and motivation of study. Makiguchi's purpose of study and life was the realization of the common people's happiness. Special attention should be paid to Makiguchi's viewpoint that pursuit of the common people's interest was justifiable and valuable. Yanagita himself was not of the common people.

---

[1]Gotō, Yanagita Kunio-ron Josetsu, pp. 134-135.

Yanagita was a first-class elite with the highest education and social status. However, in spite of such background, Yanagita's purpose and motivation of study from the beginning to the end was, like Makiguchi, the realization of the common people's happiness. He used the words, "the happiness of the entire body of the people" (kokumin sōtai no kōfuku).[1] When he said "happiness," he meant subjectively, the sense of happiness of individuals, and objectively, the increase of economic wealth. Yanagita thought that the subjective sense of individual happiness could be obtained when there is no difference of wealth.[2] Therefore, by the "happiness of the entire body of the people," Yanagita meant the increase of the national wealth and the equal distribution of that wealth. In this way, like Makiguchi, Yanagita evaluated positively the common people's pursuit of interest and made the realization of this the purpose of study. Such an understanding of happiness based on economic rationality can be found in Yanagita's early days when he was studying agricultural policy. Later in his study of folklore, his understanding of happiness changed; he paid attention not only to the economic happiness but also to spiritual happiness.[3]

The second common aspect found in Yanagita and Makiguchi

---

[1]Yanagita Kunio, "Nōseigaku" [Study of Agricultural Policy], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 28 (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1964), p. 284.

[2]Yanagita Kunio, "Nōgyō Seisakugaku" [Study of Agricultural Policy], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 28, p. 342.

[3]Fujii Takashi, "Yanagita Nōseigaku ni okeru Sangyō Kumiai no Ichi" [The Position of Industrial Union in Yanagita's Study of Agricultural Policy], Shisō, no. 623 (May 1976), p. 66.

is that they used a positivistic, inductive method as the methodology of geography and the study of folklore. However, there is a great difference in the way that they each used this methodology. I shall discuss this further later on.

(1) Lack of Social-scientific Analysis

Living in the same age and having the same academic interest and methodology, why couldn't Makiguchi have the element to transcend the age that Yanagita had? I should like to find Makiguchi's ideological weakness in the difference between Makiguchi and Yanagita.

The first weakness of Makiguchi's thought is lack of social-scientific analysis. Both Makiguchi and Yanagita dealt with the happiness of the common people as the purpose of their study. However, Makiguchi understood happiness as subjective so that he did not have any concrete idea about how the common people's happiness could be realized. Makiguchi defined happiness as the realization of the values of beauty, gain, and goodness. However, by "gain" Makiguchi meant only individual gain, and he did not talk about the way to realize individual gain, such as social policies. Makiguchi valued "goodness" highly because individuals cannot become happy as long as there is a confrontation between society and individuals. Also in this respect, his understanding of happiness is subjective.

As a scholar of agricultural policy Yanagita studied concrete ways of realizing the common people's happiness. By common people, he meant farmers who were the majority of the

population of Japan in those days. Therefore, the realization of the common people's happiness was improvement of the farmers' living conditions. According to Yanagita, the cause of the farmers' poverty was agriculture based on natural economy. Therefore, he thought that the farmers could become happy if they change their agriculture to one based on monetary economy. In other words, he thought that the farmers could obtain wealth by industrializing agriculture.[1] He studied various ideas in order to realize the industrialization of agriculture. The first idea was to make the payment of farm rent by cash. The second idea was to establish industrial unions. He thought that if the farmers could have their industrial unions, they could get rid of middlemen and accumulate capital for the industrialization of agriculture.[2] The important thing is that when Yanagita studied concrete ways of realizing the common people's happiness, he understood the structure of capitalistic society and knew how the centralized nation and capitalists were exploiting farmers. He was neither a socialist nor a supporter of laissez-faire economy. His concern was the increase of the common people's happiness, which can be realized by the increase of the national wealth and the equal distribution of the wealth. He thought that the socialist economy had a deficiency in the increase of the national wealth while the liberalistic economy has a deficiency in the equal distribution of the wealth. Yanagita's answer was

---

[1]Yanagita, "Nōgyō Seisakugaku," p. 330, p. 333, p. 335.

[2]Ibid., p. 379.

that the government should lead the farmers to improve their agricultural management by themselves through the government agricultural policy. Since he realized the evils of the centralized nation and capitalists, such as zaibatsu, he was strongly against the idea that the government should carry out its agricultural policies by force.[1] At the same time, he was opposed to farmers saving their money with big banking facilities because the latter collect money from farmers and invest this money, not for the farmers, but for the capitalists' businesses in cities.[2] Since he realized the evils of the centralization of administrative power very well, he asserted that even though the industrial unions throughout the nation should be united, the central organization of the industrial unions should be simply for education and better communication with farmers.[3]

Through the study of agricultural policy, Yanagita learned the social-scientific knowledge of the evils of the nation. He was aware of the reality of the strong and the weak in mankind and the upper and lower relationships that existed and he saw the nation take advantage of and exploit the people.[4] Based on the realization of such evils of the government, Yanagita

---

[1]Yanagita, "Nōseigaku," p. 241.

[2]Yanagita, "Nōgyō Seisakugaku," p. 391.

[3]Yanagita Kunio, "Sangyō Kumiai Shikin Yūzū-sho no Hanashi" [About Circulation Media of Industrial Union], in Yanagita Kunio Nōsei Ronshū [Collection of Yanagita Kunio's Studies on Agricultural Policy], ed. Fujii Takashi (Tokyo: Hōsei Daigaku Shuppan-kyoku, 1975), p. 94.

[4]Yanagita, "Nōseigaku," p. 218.

believed that the government then in power and the nation were not one and the same. After resigning as chief secretary of the Upper House, he was offered a job at the League of Nations. At first, he rejected this offer, saying that he no longer had any intention of working for the government. However, one of his friends told him, "It was the government, not the nation, that you conflicted with," and pursuaded him to accept the job at the League of Nations.

Concerning the nation, Yanagita stated as follows:

> The nation is not only the nation of the present. Our ancestors who died are also the people of the nation. Therefore, the nation should live up to the expectations of our ancestors. Also, the nation is eternal. The descendants who will be born in the future are also the people of the nation. Therefore, the nation should protect their interest, too.[1]

Characteristic of Yanagita's understanding of the nation is that the nation continues in spite of the change of government. This is similar to the idea of the eternity of the nation controlled by the unbroken line of Emperors which was the Meiji government's ideology of Emperor system. However, Yanagita's thought starts from his social-scientific recognition of the evils of the nation that the government is exploiting the common people. In this respect, we can say that Yanagita criticized the government and its policies and thus he had an element to transcend the government of that time and ideology.

Then, how did Makiguchi understand the nation? Makiguchi looked at the nation as the object of obedience. Not only the

---

[1]Yanagita, "Nōgyō Seisakugaku," pp. 294-295.

nation, but also the society for him was something that individuals should obey.[1] As studied earlier, Makiguchi's understanding of society was that the society is one organism while an individual is the organ of the society. Besides, in Makiguchi, the nation was equal to the government then in power.

> The existing government is the organ to administer the power of the nation. Therefore, by observing the function of the government, we can understand the functions and the purpose of the nation.[2]

He extended the limit of the society to the world. However, he saw the world still under the power of the strongest, which was far from his ideal, organic society.[3] Therefore, for him, the nation was the largest society that functioned correctly. Furthermore, he gave rankings to various societies and thought that a lower-level society should obey a high-level society.

> In society there is a distinction between the large and the small and between the high and the low. The small is included in the large, and the higher society rules the lower society, which establishes a system of order. Prefectures and provinces are parts of the nation, and they are under the rule of the nation. Under prefectures and provinces, there are cities; under cities, there are towns and villages; and under towns and villages, there are families. . . . The nation is the society of the whole, and the lower groups are societies which are part of the nation.[4]

It is impossible to expect any criticism against the government of that time from such understanding of the nation and society. Makiguchi identified the government policies with the will of society.

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (1)," p. 195.

[2]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 395.

[3]Makiguchi, "Shakai-teki Kyōikugaku," p. 268.

[4]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," p. 239.

> Laws, policies, declaration of war, and reconciliation are the will of society.[1]

From the time he was teaching in Hokkaidō, Makiguchi had thought that the purpose of education was to lead the students to be able to live a "happy community life" without conflicting with society.

> Education is to lead people to understand the purpose of life clearly, to carry out the will of society as their own will, and to establish a happy society.[2]

Makiguchi presented his thought of "happy community life" and his understanding of society as an organism in order to explain clearly his thought of the harmony of individuals and society. But he did not talk about the confrontation of gains between individuals and society. Such understanding of society and the nation can easily be identified with the ideology of the Emperor system and the ideology of the nation as a family. Makiguchi optimistically dreamed that social gain became identical with individual gain. However, if he had had the ability to analyze society scientifically and to look through the reality of society at that time, he would never have dreamed such a thing.

In Makiguchi's days, it was easy for the people to learn about Marxism if they wanted to. Whether or not they agreed with it or opposed it, all the intellectual people encountered Marxism. Makiguchi was no exception. He had contact with Marxists for ten years after he came to Tokyo. He became close to them but did

---

[1]Ibid., p. 246.

[2]Makiguchi, "Shakai-teki Kyōikugaku," pp. 265-266.

not carry out activities together with them.[1]

> The time will come when we can succeed in revolution and persuade the capitalists by creative, sound means without pursuing a destructive method. This is the right way of educators. From such a standpoint, I did not cooperate with the Marxist any further than the universal election movement, the social reform movement which does not oppose the structure of the nation.[2]

Makiguchi's pursuit of happiness as the purpose of education and life was to search for the individual, subjective happiness within the limit of the existing system without criticizing the social policies such as the structure of the nation. In this sense, the following criticism of Makiguchi done by Saki Akio, a Marxist, is correct.

> People accepted Makiguchi's thought because his thought fit with the feelings of the common people who accept the existing power as "authority," obey the authority, try to obtain their gain most effectively, and try to live a happy life within their limit.[3]

(2) Incompleteness of Inductive, Positivistic Methodology

Makiguchi chose the study of geography and Yanagita chose the study of folklore to search for the common people's happiness. They thought that the geographical, cultural, and traditional contexts of the lives of the people greatly influenced the common people's happiness. However, there was a great difference between them in the understanding of happiness as the motivation. In the early days when Yanagita was studying agricultural policy,

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei (2)," p. 21.

[2]Ibid., p. 22.

[3]Saki, "Sōka Gakkai no Kachiron," p. 6.

he looked at the problem of the common people's happiness only from the economic point of view; however, later on, his understanding of happiness and of people changed. This change is shown in the fact that Yanagita changed his study from the agricultural policy to the study of folklore. At one stage in the study of agricultural policy, Yanagita criticized the backwardness of the farmers, the common people of Japan.[1] In this period, Yanagita accepted the common people only as the object of his guidance to modern agriculture. However, after 1907 he began to feel sympathy toward the backward life of farmers based on natural economy.[2] This shows the change of his understanding of happiness and value. Before then, he thought that the relation between economic fulfillment and human happiness was the universal truth. However, he gradually felt strong sympathy toward the people who are living in nature and their traditional life even though their economics was undeveloped. This has something to do with the question he had about modernizing Japan. This change was caused by his experiences on the many trips he took as a government official of agricultural policy. When he compared the life of the people in cities with the life of the people left behind from modernization, he became skeptical about modernization. He then started the study of folklore in order to explore the native nature of the Japanese people; he thought that the most natural and the most happy thing for the Japanese people of that day and

---

[1]Yanagita, "Nōseigaku," p. 242; and Yanagita, "Nōgyō Seisakugaku," p. 334.

[2]Fujii, "Yanagita Nōseigaku ni okeru," p. 66.

for the future was to value their native nature highly and to pass it on to the next generation.

Makiguchi accepted modernization without having any doubts. For Makiguchi, human history is the history of evolutional development.[1] He thought simplistically that in the sense of public morality the West is superior to the East and the city is superior to the village.[2] He classified human beings in four ranks: (1) barbarous, (2) uncivilized, (3) semi-civilized, and (4) civilized. He thought the barbarous people to be the most inferior people and the civilized people to be the most superior people.[3] With such an idea it must have been difficult for Makiguchi to understand Yanagita's thought that the undeveloped farmers are happier than the modernized people in cities. By studying the relation of human life with geography and society, Makiguchi's purpose was to discover how the Japanese people can be modernized most efficiently. His thought of modernization was to make the nation of Japan strong and wealthy and thus to increase individual economic gain. Makiguchi did not recognize the diversity of culture; that certain people may be happier than people of a civilized nation even though their economy and culture are behind. Nor did he realize the diversity of the understanding of happiness.

Such difference in understanding of modernization between

---

[1] Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," pp. 218-219, p. 248.

[2] Ibid., p. 270, p. 483.

[3] Ibid., p. 215.

Yanagita and Makiguchi created a decisive difference between their way of study of geography and folklore. Yanagita dreamed about the establishment of the study of world folklore after completing the study of folklore of each nation. However, the most important thing for him at this stage was not to reach the universal understanding of human beings, but to search for the depth of the particularistic without neglecting diversity. He tried to discover the universal, native nature of the Japanese people by studying the folklore, and he did this in a very careful way. Since he was greatly disappointed in the deductive method which was the methodology of most of the existing studies, his inductive method of study was thorough. He strongly rejected the easy, ambiguous way of universalization.

> Suppose there are two villages in one valley, or suppose there are two villages located on the coast next to each other, we cannot judge the things about one village from the case of another village.[1]

Using an enormous amount of research materials from folklore, Yanagita universalized the native nature of the Japanese people at the final stage of his study. However, he did not do this universalization by quick judgment. Taking a thorough method of study, Yanagita finally reached the conclusion that by knowing the character and the faith of the Japanese people he could criticize the ideology of Emperor system.

Makiguchi insisted that he was following the inductive, positivistic methodology. However, Makiguchi's method of study

---

[1]Yanagita Kunio, "Jidai to Nōsei" [Age and Agricultural Policy], in Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, vol. 16, p. 14.

was not as thorough as that of Yanagita; his universalization was done quickly and without sufficient examination. For instance, he asked the question, in what area of the world is human intelligence developed most and developed least.[1] His answer to this question is not important, but the problem is that he presents such a question. While both Makiguchi and Yanagita thought of the study of the places of origin as an inductive, positivistic study, Yanagita travelled to villages all over Japan investigating them with his five senses. On the other hand, Makiguchi's positivistic, inductive methodology was not to discover a law or a truth, but to prove a law which he already had in his mind. Makiguchi emphasized actual proof in daily life. However, his positivism was not thorough like Yanagita's precise actual survey, but was based on his own subjective judgment. Therefore, he experienced neither the destruction of his thought or knowledge nor the discovery of a new fact. Makiguchi used positivism in order to assert and prove his thought; for this purpose, he presented as proof several examples which he chose subjectively. He tried neither to doubt his presupposition nor to look for facts which would deny his presupposition. In this sense, his methodology was subjective and dogmatic rather than positivistic and inductive.

For Makiguchi, the ideology of the Emperor system was not the object of actual proof as in the case of Yanagita. Makiguchi accepted the ideology of Emperor system as a truth so that it was a truth to be learned. Makiguchi tried to look for examples in

---

[1]Makiguchi, "Jinsei Chirigaku (2)," pp. 264-265.

the people's lives of the places of origin in order to prove the righteousness of the ideology of Emperor system.[1] In spite of the fact that he believed in the existence of the truth among the common people, he did not try thoroughly to search for what was the truth existing among the common people. His questioning was not thoroughgoing. He did not question government information or even himself to the end. It is arrogance not to question oneself thoroughly.

We can find such weakness in Makiguchi as the incompleteness of positivism and questioning his understanding of religion. As stated in Chapter V of this dissertation concerning Makiguchi's conversion, Nichiren Shōshū was necessary for him; it was a valuable thing for him. However, he did not simply accept it as a necessary, valuable thing for him; he tried to prove the truth of this religion by using "experimental proofs of a religion." Here also, his positivistic methodology was a subjective one. He presented several examples which were convenient for his thought, and he simply believed that the truth of this religion was proved.

On the other hand, Yanagita did not have his own religion. His position was scientific, based on national studies (kokugaku); he disliked Christianity, Confucianism, and Buddhism. However, he had tolerance to accept others as they were even though they were different from him.

> I want them to realize what they believe in without interference, if they truly believe in it from their hearts. It is easy to tear down what others have. However, I know many

---

[1] Makiguchi, "Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin," pp. 32-33, pp. 390-391.

> cases in which, as a result of the destruction of what they had, they could not find anything to replace it and immediately were led into a dissolute life. Therefore, I respect the idea that everyone should rely on what he freely believes in. With this kind of feeling, I would not dissuade my daughter if she wanted to become a Christian. In the past, I acted contrary to this, and now I am sorry for what I did. My elder sister-in-law had a strong Christian faith and was baptized. I denounced her with a meaningless argument. Since she was powerless against my words, she gave up her faith. Soon after that, she died. I feel very sorry for her, thinking that she must have been anxious in her last moments.[1]

Yanagita highly valued being natural. He considered ancestor worship as an important thing, even though he did not accept it as his own religion, because he thought that it was natural for the Japanese common people.

Having such a viewpoint, Yanagita hated people who force others to accept a thought or a religion as the truth without examining it sufficiently. Concerning the relationship between Yanagita and Makiguchi after conversion, Yajima Shūhei, one of Makiguchi's followers, stated as follows:

> One day, Makiguchi took me to the house of Yanagita who was an adviser to the Value-creating Educational Society. Both Yanagita and Makiguchi enjoyed talking about their works aiming for the good of this world. However, when Makiguchi started to talk about the Lotus Sutra, Yanagita roared with anger, "Go home." Yanagita pushed us out of the house and closed the door. On our way back home, Makiguchi said, "It is sad to see that the highest intellectual person in Japan does not understand our faith. This was nijōzōjōman, the arrogance of the intellectual people described in the Lotus Sutra.[2]

Makiguchi judged Yanagita's attitude as an arrogance. However,

---

[1]Yanagita, "Watakushi no Tetsugaku," p. 157.

[2]Yajima Shūkaku, "Hokekyō ka Marukusu-shugi ka" [The Lotus Sutra or Marxism?], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, ed. Misaka Fusahiro, p. 476.

> cases in which, as a result of the destruction of what they had, they could not find anything to replace it and immediately were led into a dissolute life. Therefore, I respect the idea that everyone should rely on what he freely believes in. With this kind of feeling, I would not dissuade my daughter if she wanted to become a Christian. In the past, I acted contrary to this, and now I am sorry for what I did. My elder sister-in-law had a strong Christian faith and was baptized. I denounced her with a meaningless argument. Since she was powerless against my words, she gave up her faith. Soon after that, she died. I feel very sorry for her, thinking that she must have been anxious in her last moments.[1]

Yanagita highly valued being natural. He considered ancestor worship as an important thing, even though he did not accept it as his own religion, because he thought that it was natural for the Japanese common people.

Having such a viewpoint, Yanagita hated people who force others to accept a thought or a religion as the truth without examining it sufficiently. Concerning the relationship between Yanagita and Makiguchi after conversion, Yajima Shūhei, one of Makiguchi's followers, stated as follows:

> One day, Makiguchi took me to the house of Yanagita who was an adviser to the Value-creating Educational Society. Both Yanagita and Makiguchi enjoyed talking about their works aiming for the good of this world. However, when Makiguchi started to talk about the Lotus Sutra, Yanagita roared with anger, "Go home." Yanagita pushed us out of the house and closed the door. On our way back home, Makiguchi said, "It is sad to see that the highest intellectual person in Japan does not understand our faith. This was nijōzōjōman, the arrogance of the intellectual people described in the Lotus Sutra.[2]

Makiguchi judged Yanagita's attitude as an arrogance. However,

---

[1]Yanagita, "Watakushi no Tetsugaku," p. 157.

[2]Yajima Shūkaku, "Hokekyō ka Marukusu-shugi ka" [The Lotus Sutra or Marxism?], in Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, ed. Misaka Fusahiro, p. 476.

the reality was that Yanagita realized the incompleteness of Makiguchi's positivistic methodology in his acceptance of religion and became angry at the arrogance of Makiguchi's thought.

The present Sōka Gakkai does not take into consideration such problems in Makiguchi's thought that I have analyzed in this dissertation. Moreover, not to have any doubt about authority and about himself which is the major weakness of Makiguchi has been carried on by members of Sōka Gakkai. This can be seen in their faith to the president of Sōka Gakkai which is similar to Makiguchi's Emperor worship and in their absolutization of Sōka Gakkai. If the present Sōka Gakkai criticizes the problems found in Makiguchi's thought from within, it can have a truly meaningful existence in Japan. A meaningful thought with the transcendent element appears not from arrogance, but from doubt about oneself and tolerance to others. I think that these words of Uchimura Kanzō about Christian tolerance have a universal meaning to all thought, including the thought of Makiguchi and of Sōka Gakkai:

> The true liberality, as I take it, is allowance and forbearance of all honest beliefs with an unflinching conviction in one's own faith. Belief in myself that I can know some Truth, and disbelief in myself that I can know all Truths, are the foundations of the true Christian liberality, the sources of all goodwills and peaceful dealing with all mankind.[1]

---

[1]Uchimura Kanzō, How I became a Christian (Tokyo: Keiseisha, 1895), p. 115.

APPENDIX

List of Japanese Words

Amaterasu Ōmikami	天照大神	Sun-goddess. The ancestor deity of the Emperor.
Amatsukami	天津神	Deities of heaven.
bushidō	武士道	The way of warrior.
chū	忠	Loyalty.
Daigohonzon	大御本尊	The great object of worship for Nichiren Shōshū. A large wooden plaque in Taisekiji temple on which Nichiren's daimoku is carved.
Daijōsai	大嘗祭	The imperial ritual of coronation.
daimoku	題目	The Nichiren prayer. The sacred phrase embodying title of the Lotus Sutra.
fukoku kyōhei	富国強兵	The wealth and armament of a country.
gohonzon	御本尊	Same as honzon.
goji hakkyō	五時八教	The five periods and eight kinds of Buddha's teaching. Chih-i's way of organizing sutras.
gokō	五綱	The five principles of Nichiren to judge sutras and sects.
goriyaku-shinkō	御利益信仰	Faith of divine favor.
heimin	平民	Commoners.

Hito no Michi	ひとのみち	A new religion.
Hokkaidō	北海道	The northernmost of the four large islands of Japan.
honmon	本門	True teaching.
honzon	本尊	The sacred object of worship.
ichinen sanzen	一念三千	The three thousand worlds in a momentary state of existence.
ji no ichinen sanzen	事の一念三千	Ichinen sanzen of fact.
jikkai	十界	Ten states of existence.
Jōgyō-Bosatsu	上行菩薩	Eminent Conduct Bodhisattva.
jōmin	常民	Common people.
jūnyoze	十如是	Ten factors of existence.
Kachiron	価値論	Philosophy of Value
Kachi Sōzō	価値創造	Value-creation. The name of an organ of Value-creating Educational Society.
kaidan	戒壇	The ordination platform.
Kankyō	環境	Environment. The name of an organ of Value-creating Educational Society.
Kannon	観音	Merciful Bodhisattva.
karagokoro	唐心	The Chinese mind.
kazoku kokka-ron	家族国家論	The nation-as-a-family ideology.
kō	孝	Filial piety.
kokumin sōtai no kōfuku	国民総体の幸福	The happiness of the entire body of the people.
kokutai	国体	National structure.

Kojiki	古事記	Record of Ancient Matters.
kokugaku	国学	National studies.
koyū shinkō	固有信仰	The native faith.
Kunitsukami	国津神	The deities of the earth.
Kyōdokai	郷土会	The Academic Society of Places of Origin.
magokoro	真心	True heart.
mandala	曼荼羅	Graphic symbol of the universe.
mappō	末法	The age of last law.
Meiji	明治	Year period, 1868-1912.
michi	道	The human way.
minkan denshō	民間伝承	Popular tradition.
Mukyōkai	無教会	The Non-Church Christian sect founded by Uchimura Kanzō.
Nam-Myōhō-Rengekyō	南無妙法蓮華経	Word of Nichiren prayer meaning "Glory to the Lotus Sutra of the Supreme Law."
Nichiren	日蓮	One of the thirteenth-century reformers of Buddhism in Japan.
Nichiren Shōshū	日蓮正宗	Literally translated, "the orthodox sect of Nichiren," which was founded by Nikkō.
Nichiren-shū	日蓮宗	Buddhist sects which believe in Nichiren.
Nihon minzoku-gaku	日本民俗学	The study of folklore of Japan.
Nihonshoki	日本書紀	Chronicles of Japan.

nijōzōjōman	二乗増上慢	The arrogance of the intellectual people.
Nikkō	日興	The founder of Nichiren Shōshū.
nochinoyo-buri	後の世ぶり	Later-age manners.
ōbutsu myōgō	王仏冥合	Harmonious blending of the government and Buddhism.
Ōmotokyō	大本教	A new religion.
ri no ichinen sanzen	理の一念三千	Ichinen sanzen of principle.
Risshō Kōseikai	立正佼正会	A new religion of Nichiren Buddhism.
samurai	侍，士	a warrior.
sandai hihō	三大秘法	The three great secret laws.
sanjin	山人	Men of mountains.
sanseken	三世間	Three worlds.
sanshō	三証	Three proofs for Nichiren to judge sutras and sects.
shakubuku	折伏	Method of proselytizing by activism.
shakumon	迹門	Provisional teaching.
Shinkyō	新教	New Teaching. The name of an organ of Value-creating Educational Society.
shūshin	修身	The lesson in morals.
Sōka Gakkai	創価学会	Value-creating Academic Society.
Sōka Kyōiku Gakkai	創価教育学会	Value-creating Educational Society. The former name of Sōka Gakkai.

Taisekiji	大石寺	The head temple of Nichiren Shōshū.
Taishō	大正	Year period, 1912-1926.
taizen seikatsu-hō	大善生活法	The way of major-good life.
Tenri-honmichi	天理本道	A sect of Tenrikyō.
Tenrikyō	天理教	A Shintoistic new religion.
totsukuni-buri	外ッ国ぶり	Foreignism.
ujigami	氏神	Tutelary deities.
waka	和歌	Japanese poetry.
zaibatsu	財閥	The supercorporations of modern Japan.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The agency for Cultural Affairs, ed. Japanese Religion. Tokyo and Palo Alto: Kōdansha International, 1974.

Akashi, Hirotaka, and Matsuura, Sōzō, ed. Shōwa Tokkō Dan'atsu-shi [History of Oppression by the Special Secret Service Police during the Shōwa Era]. vol. 2, vol. 3, and vol. 4. Tokyo: Taihei Shuppan-sha, 1975.

Anesaki, Masaharu. Hokekyō no Gyōja Nichiren [Nichiren, the Practitioner of the Lotus Sutra]. Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1933.

————. Nichiren, the Buddhist Prophet. London: Harvard University Press, 1916.

Aoki, Tamotsu. "Some Remarks of the New Religion Movement in Contemporary Japan." East Asian Cultural Studies. vol. 11, nos. 1-4 (March 1972): pp. 106-112.

Ayuzawa, Masaharu. Jinmon Chirigaku Josetsu [Introduction to Human Geography]. Tokyo: Sekai Shoin, 1949.

Beals, David R. "The Sōka Gakkai Movement in Modern Japan." M. Th. theses, Berkeley Baptist Divinity School, 1965.

Bellah, Robert N. Tokugawa Religion. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.

————. "Watsuji Tetsurō Ron" [A Study of Watsuji Tetsurō]. Translated by Katsube Masanaga. In Watsuji Tetsurō Shū [Collection of Watsuji Tetsurō's Works], pp. 381-408. Edited by Umehara Takeshi. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1974.

Bethel, Dayle M. Makiguchi the Value Creator, Revolutionary Japanese Educator and Founder of Soka Gakkai. New York and Tokyo: Weatherhill, 1973.

Bloom, Paul. "Observations in the Study of Contemporary Nichiren Buddhism." Contemporary Religions in Japan. vol. 6, no. 1 (March 1965): pp. 58-74.

Brannen, Noah. "False Religions, Forced Conversions, Iconolasm." Contemporary Religions in Japan. vol. 5, no. 3 (September 1964): pp. 232-252.

————, trans. "Happiness and Life's Objective. Chapter 4 of Shakubuku Kyoten." Contemporary Religions in Japan. vol. 8, no. 2 (June 1967): pp. 135-144.

————. Sōka Gakkai, Japan's Militant Buddhists. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1968.

————. "Sōka Gakkai's Theory of Value." Contemporary Religions in Japan. vol. 5, no. 2 (June 1964): pp. 143-154.

————. "The Teaching of Soka Gakkai." Contemporary Religions in Japan. vol. 3, no. 3 (September 1962): pp. 247-263.

Chūō Tō Gakkō. Sōka Gakkai, Sono Mondaiten [Problems of Sōka Gakkai]. Tokyo: Nihon Shakaitō Kikanshi-kyoku, 1962.

Dator, James A. Sōka Gakkai, Builders of the Third Civilization. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1969.

————. "The Sōka Gakkai: A Socio-Political Interpretation." Contemporary Religions in Japan. vol. 6, no. 3 (September 1965): pp. 205-242.

Digan, Parig. "Religion in Postwar Japan--the Shape of Belonging: Some Statistics Scrutinized." Japan Missionary Bulletin. vol. 26, no. 3 (April 1972): pp. 213-222.

Dumoulin, Heinrich. "Buddhismus im modernen Japan." Saeculum. vol. 20, nos. 2-4 (January 1969): pp. 330-351.

————. "Soka Gakkai." Katholische Missionen. vol. 83 (January-February 1964): pp. 14-21.

————. "Soka Gakkai, eine moderne Volksreligion: ein Besuch im Haupttempel Taisekiji." In Das moderne Japan: einfuhrende Aufsatze. pp. 189-200. Edited by Joseph Roggendorf. Tokyo: Sophia-Universitat, 1963.

Durkheim, Emile. Education and Sociology. Translated by Sherwood D. Fox. Illinois: The Free Press, 1956.

Earhart, H. Byron. The New Religions of Japan: A Bibliography of Western-language Materials. Tokyo: Sophia University, 1970.

Endō, Yoshimitsu. "Soka Gakkai, the Study of a Society for the Creation of Value." Anglican Theological Review. vol. 46, no. 1 (January 1964): pp. 131-141.

Fujii, Takashi, ed. Yanagita Kunio Nōsei Ronshū [Collection of Yanagita Kunio's Studies on Agricultural Policy]. Tokyo: Hōsei Daigaku Shuppan-kyoku, 1975.

———. "Yanagita Nōseigaku ni okeru Sangyō Kumiai no Ichi" [The Position of Industrial Union in Yanagita's Study of Agricultural Policy]. Shisō. no. 623 (May 1976): pp. 46-67.

Fujita, Shōzō. Tennōsei Kokka no Shihai Genri [Ruling Ideology of the Emperor-system Nation]. Tokyo: Mirai-sha, 1974.

Fujiwara, Hirotatsu. Sōka Gakkai o Kiru [I Denounce Sōka Gakkai]. Tokyo: Nisshin Hōdō Shuppanbu, 1970.

Fukawa, Kiyoshi. Kinsei Nihon no Minshū Rinri Shisō [Ethical Thought of Common People in Tokugawa Period]. Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1973.

Fukyō Kenkyū-sho, ed. Sōka Gakkai no Kentō [Analysis of Sōka Gakkai]. Kyoto: Hyakkaen, 1961.

Gotō, Sōichirō, ed. Hito to Shisō: Yanagita Kunio [Personality and Thought: Yanagita Kunio]. Tokyo: San'itsu Shobō, 1973.

———. Yanagita Kunio-ron Josetsu [Introduction to the Study of Yanagita Kunio]. Tokyo: Dentō to Gendai-sha, 1972.

Hashikawa Bunzō. "Yanagita Kunio." In Hito to Shisō: Yanagita Kunio, pp. 244-338. Edited by Gotō Sōichirō. Tokyo: San'itsu Shobō, 1973.

Hesselgrave, David J. "The Background and Methodology of Sōka Gakkai Propagation: An Overview and Brief Rhetorical Analysis." Studies on Asia. vol. 7 (1966): pp. 65-76.

———. "A Propagation Profile of the Soka Gakkai." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1965.

Ichikawa, Hakugen. Bukkyō-sha no Sensō Sekinin [Buddhists' Responsibility to the War]. Tokyo: Shunjū-sha, 1970.

Ienaga, Saburō. "Japan's Modernization and Buddhism." Contemporary Religions in Japan. vol. 6, no. 1 (March 1965): pp. 1-41.

———. "Yanagita Shigaku-ron" [Yanagita's Study of History]. In Hito to Shisō: Yanagita Kunio, pp. 139-180. Edited by Gotō Sōichirō.

Ikado, Fujio. "Gense Rieki: Sono Ronri to Shinri" [Divine Favor: Its Logics and Psychology]. Nihon Bukkyō. vol. 34 (February 1972): pp. 1-23.

———. "Trend and Problems of New Religions: Religion in Urban Society." In The Sociology of Japanese Religion, pp. 101-117. Edited by Morioka Kiyomi, and William H. Newell. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.

UMI

———. "Yanagita Nōseigaku ni okeru Sangyō Kumiai no Ichi" [The Position of Industrial Union in Yanagita's Study of Agricultural Policy]. Shisō. no. 623 (May 1976): pp. 46-67.

Fujita, Shōzō. Tennōsei Kokka no Shihai Genri [Ruling Ideology of the Emperor-system Nation]. Tokyo: Mirai-sha, 1974.

Fujiwara, Hirotatsu. Sōka Gakkai o Kiru [I Denounce Sōka Gakkai]. Tokyo: Nisshin Hōdō Shuppanbu, 1970.

Fukawa, Kiyoshi. Kinsei Nihon no Minshū Rinri Shisō [Ethical Thought of Common People in Tokugawa Period]. Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1973.

Fukyō Kenkyū-sho, ed. Sōka Gakkai no Kentō [Analysis of Sōka Gakkai]. Kyoto: Hyakkaen, 1961.

Gotō, Sōichirō, ed. Hito to Shisō: Yanagita Kunio [Personality and Thought: Yanagita Kunio]. Tokyo: San'itsu Shobō, 1973.

———. Yanagita Kunio-ron Josetsu [Introduction to the Study of Yanagita Kunio]. Tokyo: Dentō to Gendai-sha, 1972.

Hashikawa Bunzō. "Yanagita Kunio." In Hito to Shisō: Yanagita Kunio, pp. 244-338. Edited by Gotō Sōichirō. Tokyo: San'itsu Shobō, 1973.

Hesselgrave, David J. "The Background and Methodology of Sōka Gakkai Propagation: An Overview and Brief Rhetorical Analysis." Studies on Asia. vol. 7 (1966): pp. 65-76.

———. "A Propagation Profile of the Soka Gakkai." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1965.

Ichikawa, Hakugen. Bukkyō-sha no Sensō Sekinin [Buddhists' Responsibility to the War]. Tokyo: Shunjū-sha, 1970.

Ienaga, Saburō. "Japan's Modernization and Buddhism." Contemporary Religions in Japan. vol. 6, no. 1 (March 1965): pp. 1-41.

———. "Yanagita Shigaku-ron" [Yanagita's Study of History]. In Hito to Shisō: Yanagita Kunio, pp. 139-180. Edited by Gotō Sōichirō.

Ikado, Fujio. "Gense Rieki: Sono Ronri to Shinri" [Divine Favor: Its Logics and Psychology]. Nihon Bukkyō. vol. 34 (February 1972): pp. 1-23.

———. "Trend and Problems of New Religions: Religion in Urban Society." In The Sociology of Japanese Religion, pp. 101-117. Edited by Morioka Kiyomi, and William H. Newell. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.

Ikeda, Daisaku. Ikeda Kaichō Zenshū [Collection of President Ikeda's Works]. 8 vols. Tokyo: Sōka Gakkai, 1968-1974.

————. Ningen Kakumei [Human Revolution]. 8 vols. (uncompleted). Tokyo: Seikyō Shinbun-sha, 1965-1976.

Ikeda, Satoshi. Makiguchi Tsunesaburō. Tokyo: Nihon Sono Shobō, 1969.

Inagaki, Masami. Butsuda o Seoite Gaitō e, Senoo Girō to Shinkō Bukkyō Seinen Dōmei [Go out to Streets Bearing Buddha on the Back]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1974.

International Institute for the Study of Religions. "Soka Gakkai and the Nichiren Sho Sect." Contemporary Religions in Japan. vol. 1, no. 1 (March 1960): pp. 55-70; vol. 1, no. 2 (June 1960): pp. 48-54.

Ishida, Takeshi. Kindai Nihon Seiji Kōzō no Kenkyū [The Study of the Structure of the Politics of Modern Japan]. Tokyo: Mirai-sha, 1974.

Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppan-sha, 1965.

Jiji Nenkan, 1976 [Jiji Yearbook, 1976]. Tokyo: Jiji Tsūshin-sha, 1975.

Kamio, Takeo. "Sōka Kyōiku Gakusetsu Seiritsu no Katei" [The Composing Process of Value-creating Educational Theory]. Tōyō Gakujutsu Kenkyū. vol. 5, no. 4 (July 1966): pp. 1-17; vol. 5, no. 8 (November 1966): pp. 1-22.

Kamishima, Jirō. Yanagita Kunio Kenkyū [Study of Yanagita Kunio]. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1973.

Kasahara, Kazuo, ed. Nihon-shi ni okeru Kachikan no Keifu [Genealogy of Understanding of Value in Japanese History]. Tokyo: Hyōron-sha, 1973.

————. Sōka Gakkai to Honganji Kyōdan [Sōka Gakkai and Honganji]. Tokyo: Shin Jinbutsu Ōrai-sha, 1970.

————. Tenkanki no Shūkyō: Shin-shū, Tenri-kyō, Sōka Gakkai [Religions in Transition Periods: Shin-Buddhism, Tenri-kyō and Sōka Gakkai]. Tokyo: Nippon Hōsō Shuppan Kyōkai, 1972.

Kino, Kazuyoshi. Hokekyō no Tankyū [A Quest of the Lotus Sutra]. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1975.

————, and Umehara, Takeshi. Eien no Inochi: Nichiren [Eternal Life: Nichiren]. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1970.

Kitagawa, Joseph M. Religion in Japanese History. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Kobayashi, Sakae. "Soka Gakkai, a Strange Buddhist Sect." Japan Christian Quarterly. vol. 24, no. 2 (April 1958): pp. 104-111.

Kodaira, Yoshihei. Sōka Gakkai. Tokyo: Ōtori Shoin, 1963.

Koepping, Peter. "Soka Gakkai--die kämpferishe neue Religion Japans." Indo Asia. vol. 11, no. 3 (July 1969): pp. 247-257.

Kohler, Werner. Die Lotus-Lehre und die modernen Religionen in Japan. Zürich: Atrantis-Verlag, 1962.

Kokuchū-kai Kyōmu-bu, ed. Sōka Gakkai Hihan [Critique of Sōka Gakkai]. Tokyo: Shin Sekai-sha, 1962.

Kudō, Takuya. "The Faith of Soka Gakkai." Contemporary Religions in Japan. vol. 2, no. 2 (June 1961): pp. 1-12.

Kumagai, Kazunori. Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō [Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Personality and Thought]. Tokyo: Daisan Bunmei-sha, 1972.

———. "Makiguchi Tsunesaburō no Shōgai to Shisō" [Life and Thought of Makiguchi Tsunesaburō]. Ushio. vol. 20 (January 1971): pp. 256-291.

McFarland, H. Neil. The Rush Hour of the Gods. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967.

Makiguchi, Tsunesaburō. Chiri Kyōju no Hōhō oyobi Naiyō no Kenkyū [Study of the Method and the Content of Teaching Geography]. Tokyo: Meguro Shoten, 1916.

———. "Gakkō Kyōiku no Mokuhyō" [The Goal of School Education]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, pp. 275-277. By Kumagai Kazunori.

———. "Gakkō no Kyōdō Seikatsu" [Community Life at School]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, pp. 273-275. By Kumagai Kazunori.

———. "Gakkō Tōsei Mondai" [About the Control of the School]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, pp. 317-319. By Kumagai Kazunori.

———. "Gakusei Keitō no Konpon-teki Kaikaku no Senketsu Mondai Ikan" [What is the Prior Problem for the Fundamental Reformation of the Educational System]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū [Collection of Makiguchi Tsunesaburō's

Works]. vol. 5, pp. 475-477. Edited by Ikeda Daisaku. Tokyo: Tōzai Tetsugaku Shoin, 1965.

————. "Hōbatsu-ron" [The Study of Punishment]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 551-554.

————. "Hokekyō no Shinja to Gyōja to Gakusha oyobi Sono Kenkyū-hō" [The Methodology of the Study of Believers, Practitioners, and Scholars of the Lotus Sutra]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 513-520.

————. "Hon Sōkai wa Taizen Seikatsu no Sōgō Tenrankai" [This Annual Meeting is an Exhibition of the Major-good Life]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, pp. 340-344. By Kumagai Kazunori.

————. "Jinsei Chirigaku" [Human-life Geography]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 3 and vol. 4. Edited by Ikeda Daisaku. Tokyo: Tōzai Tetsugaku Shoin, 1965.

————. "Kachi Hantei no Hyōjun" [The Criteria for Value Judgment]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 544-550.

————. "Kagaku to Shūkyō to no Kankei o Ronzu: Ishihara Rigaku Hakase no Kagaku to Shūkyō o Yomite" [The Relation between Science and Religion: My Reflection upon Dr. Ishihara's Science and Religion]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 502-512.

————. "Kokutai Meibi to Shūkyō Kakumei" [Clarification of the Fundamental Concept of National Structure and Reformation of Religions]. Shinkyō. vol. 6, no. 2 (February 1936).

————. "Kōzui Jūōdan to Kyōiku Shūkyō Kakumei" [Ōtani Kōzui's Essay and Educational, Religious Revolution]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 490-501.

————. "Kunren-jō yori Mitaru Takyū to Tankyū" [Age-group-class System and One-room-school System from the Viewpoint of Training]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, pp. 258-265. Edited by Kumagai Kazunori.

————. "Kyōiku Kokusaku no Konkan-teki Rokudai Mondai" [Six Fundamental Problems of Government's Educational Policy]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 467-474.

————. "Kyōiku-sha no Ren'ai no Mondai" [About Teacher's Love]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 486-489.

————. "Kyōiku Taido-ron" [Study of Teaching Attitude]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 457-466.

———. "Kyōju no Tōgō Chūshin to shite no Kyōdoka Kenkyū" [Study of Places of Origin as the Core of All Lessons]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 1-434.

———. "Mokuteki-kan no Kakuritsu" [Establishment of the View of Purpose]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 530-531.

———. "Mōmoku-teki no Seikatsu" [Life Made Blindly]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, pp. 321-326. By Kumagai Kazunori.

———. Philosophy of Value. Translated by Translation Division Overseas Bureau. Tokyo: Seikyō Press, 1964.

———. "Shakai-teki Kyōikugaku no Jitchi-teki Hōmen" [Practical Aspect of Social Pedagogy]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, pp. 265-271. By Kumagai Kazunori.

———. "Shin Taisei no Risō taru Taizen Seikatsu-hō no Igi to Kanō" [Meaning and Possibility of the Way of Major-good Life as the Ideal for New Structure of the Nation]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 525-529.

———. "Shokan" [Letters from the Prison]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 555-572.

———. "Shūkyō Kaikaku Zōsa Nashi" [It is Easy to Reform Religions]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 541-543.

———. "Sōka Kyōikugaku ni motozuku Kokugoka (Yomi-kata, Tsuzuri-kata) Kyōju no Kenkyū Happyō" [Study of Teaching Japanese (Reading and Writing) Based on the Value-creating Pedagogy]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 478-485.

———. "Sōka Kyōikugaku Shoron" [An Introduction to Value-creating Education]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, pp. 297-313. By Kumagai Kazunori.

———. "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei" [The Value-creating Educational System]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 1 and vol. 2. Edited by Ikeda Daisaku. Tokyo: Tōzai Tetsugaku Shoin, 1965.

———. Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei II [The Value-creating Educational System II]. Tokyo: Seikyō Shinbun-sha, 1972.

———. "Sōka Kyōikugaku Taikei Kōgai" [A Summary of the Value-creating Educational System]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 437-456.

———. Sōka Kyōiku-hō no Kagaku-teki Chō-shūkyō-teki Jikken Shōmei [Scientific and Trans-religious Experiment and Proof of Value-creating Education]. Tokyo: Sōka Kyōiku Gakkai, 1937.

———. "Taizen Seikatsu-hō Jikken Shōmei no Shidō Yōryō" [The Guidance for Experiment and Proof of the Way of Major-good Life]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 521-524.

———. "Taizen Seikatsu-hō no Jissen" [Practice of the Major-good Life]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 539-540.

———. "Taizen Seikatsu-hō no Teishō" [Proposal of the Way of Major-good Life]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 532-534.

———. "Taizen Seikatsu-hō sunawachi Ningen no Heibon Seikatsu ni" [To Make the Way of Major-good Life Man's Daily Life]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 5, pp. 535-538.

———. "Taizen Seikatsu no Konpon Genri" [Basic Principle of the Major-good Life]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō: Hito to Shisō, pp. 337-338. By Kumagai Kazunori.

Maruyama, Teruo. "Sōka Gakkai no Shakai-shugi: Konnichi Nichiren no Shūkyō o Toitadasu koto no Imi ni tsuite" [Sōka Gakkai's Socialism: The Meaning of Asking Nichiren's Religion Today]. Shisō no Kagaku. vol. 92 (September 1969). pp. 89-99.

Masamune, Hakuchō. Kaisō [Retrospection]. Masamune Hakuchō Zenshū [Collection of Masamune Hakuchō's Works], vol. 12. Tokyo: Shinchō-sha, 1966.

Misaka, Fusahiro, ed. Makiguchi Tsunesaburō. Tokyo: Seikyō Shinbun-sha, 1973.

Miyagawa, Tōru. Kindai Nihon no Tetsugaku [Philosophy of Modern Japan]. Tokyo: Keisō Shobō, 1962.

Miyake, Jun. "Nihon-jin no Shūkyō Seikatsu to Gense Rieki" [Religious Life of Japanese People and Divine Favor]. Nihon Bukkyō. vol. 34 (February 1972): pp. 24-37.

Miyata, Noboru. Ikigami Shinkō [Faith in Man-God]. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1970.

Mochizuki, Kankō, ed. Kindai Nihon no Hokke Bukkyō [Buddhism of the Lotus Sutra in Modern Japan]. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1968.

UMI

———. Nichiren Kyōgaku no Kenkyū [A Study of the Doctrines of Nichiren Buddhism]. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1958.

Moos, Felix. "Religion and Politics in Japan: The Case of the Sōka Gakkai." Asian Survey. vol. 3, no. 3 (March 1963): pp. 136-142.

Moriyama, Satoshi. Sōka Gakkai no Machigai o Tadasu: Kirisuto-kyō Shakubuku ni Kotaete [Criticism of Sōka Gakkai: Answer to the Criticism of Christianity by Sōka Gakkai]. Tokyo: Nihon Kirisutokyō-dan Tokyo Kyōkai Shuppan-bu, 1965.

Moto'ori, Norinaga. "Tamakatsuma" [Bamboo Fence]. In Moto'ori Norinaga Zenshū [Collection of Moto'ori Norinaga's Works]. vol. 1, pp. 31-476. Edited by Ōno Susumu. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1968.

Murakami, Shigeyoshi. Kokka Shintō [National Shintoism]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1974.

———. "New Religions in Japan." East Asian Cultural Studies. vol. 11, nos. 1-4 (March 1972): pp. 17-27.

———. Sōka Gakkai: Kōmeitō [Sōka Gakkai: Clean Government Party]. Tokyo: Aoki Shoten, 1967.

Murata, Kiyoaki. Japan's New Buddhism. New York and Tokyo: Weatherhill, 1971.

Nakaba, Tadakuni, and Asano, Hidemitsu. Amerika no Nichiren Shōshū [Nichiren Shōshū of America]. Tokyo: Senseki Shuppan-sha, 1972.

Nakamura Akira. Shinpan: Yanagita Kunio no Shisō [Thought of Yanagita Kunio, New Edition]. Tokyo: Hōsei Daigaku Shuppan-kyoku, 1974.

Nakamura, Hajime, ed. Shin, Bukkyō Jiten [Dictionary of Buddhism: Revised Version]. Tokyo: Seishin Shobō, 1972.

Nakano, Kyōtoku, ed. Senjika no Bukkyō [Buddhism during World War II]. Tokyo: Tosho Kankō-kai, 1977.

Nielsen, Niels C., Jr. "Japan's 'New Religions'." Christian Century. vol. 74, no. 41 (9 October 1957): pp. 1196-1198.

Nihon Bungaku Kenkyū Shiryō Kankō Kai, ed. Yanagita Kunio. Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1976.

Nihon Kindai Kyōiku-shi Jiten Henshū Iinkai, ed. Nihon Kindai Kyōiku-shi Jiten [Dictionary of Education in Modern Japan]. Tokyo: Heibon-sha, 1971.

Nihon Kyōsantō Chūō Iinkai Shuppan-kyoku, ed. Sōka Gakkai: Kyōgi to Rinen Hihan [Sōka Gakkai: Criticism of Its Doctrines and Ideas]. Tokyo: Nihon Kyōsantō Chūō Iinkai Shuppan-kyoku, 1971.

Nishio, Harry K. "Comparative Analysis of the Risshō Kōseikai and the Sōka Gakkai." Asian Survey. vol. 7, no. 11 (November 1967): pp. 776-791.

Offner, Clark B. "Soka Gakkai." Japan Christian Quarterly. vol. 35, no. 3 (Summer 1969): pp. 153-161.

Oguchi, Iichi, and Saki, Akio. Sōka Gakkai. Tokyo: Aoki Shoten, 1957.

Ōhara, Shōjitsu. Shinshū yori Mitaru Sōka Gakkai [Analysis of Sōka Gakkai from Shin Buddhism]. Kyoto: Honganji Shuppan Kyōkai, 1963.

Ōishi, Shūten. "The New Religious Sects of Japan." Review of The New Religions of Japan, by Harry Thomsen. Contemporary Religions in Japan. vol. 5, no. 1 (March 1964): pp. 45-80.

Risshō Daigaku Nichiren Kyōgaku Kenkyūsho, ed. Nichiren Kyōdan Zenshi [History of Nichiren Sects]. vol. 1. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1973.

Saegusa, Mitsuyoshi. Hokekyō Gendaigo Yaku [The Lotus Sutra: Translated into Modern Japanese]. 3 vols. Tokyo: Daisan Bunmei-sha, 1974.

Saki, Akio. "Sōka Gakkai no Kachiron--Hibidarake no Riron-teki Shuchū" [Philosophy of Value of Sōka Gakkai--Theoretical Pillar with Cracks]. Bunka Hyōron. no. 24 (October 1963): pp. 1-9.

Sako, Jun'ichirō. "Ōinaru Isan" [Great Inheritance]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū, Geppō [Collection of Yanagita Kunio's Works, Monthly Report], no. 10, pp. 79-80. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, September 1969.

Schiffer, Wilhelm. "New Religions in Postwar Japan." Monumenta Nipponica. vol. 11, no. 1 (April 1955): pp. 1-14.

————. "The Soka Gakkai: Its History and Its Claims." France-Asie. vol. 19, no. 182 (January-March 1964): pp. 1111-1118.

Sekai Bukkyō Kyōkai, ed. Sōka Gakkai o Shakubuku suru [Critique of Sōka Gakkai]. Tokyo: Jitsugyō no Sekai-sha, 1962.

Shiga, Shigetaka. "Nihon Fūkei-ron" [Study of Japan's Landscapes]. In Shiga Shigetaka Zenshū [Collection of the Works of Shiga Shigetaka]. vol. 4, pp. 1-194. Edited by Shiga Fujio. Tokyo: Shiga Shigetaka Zenshū Kankō Kai, 1928.

Shigyō, Kaishū. Nichiren-shū Kyōgaku-shi [History of the Doctrines of Nichiren Buddhism]. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1972.

Shimonaka, Yasaburō, ed. Kyōikugaku Jiten [Dictionary of Education]. Tokyo: Heibon-sha, 1956.

Sōka Gakkai. The Nichiren Shoshu Sokagakkai. Tokyo: Seikyo Press, 1966.

Sōka Gakkai Kyōgaku-bu, ed. Nichiren Daishōnin Gosho [Collection of Nichiren's Works]. Tokyo: Sōka Gakkai, 1974.

————, ed. Shakubuku Kyōten [Guidance Book for Shakubuku]. Tokyo: Sōka Gakkai, 1964.

————, ed. Sōka Gakkai Nyūmon [Introduction to Sōka Gakkai]. Tokyo: Seikyō Shinbun-sha, 1975.

Sōka Gakkai Yonjū-nen-shi Hensan Iinkai, ed. Sōka Gakkai 40-nen-shi [History of Sōka Gakkai from 1930-1970]. Tokyo: Sōka Gakkai, 1970.

Souda, Kiichirō. Bunka Kachi to Kyokugen Gainen [Cultural Value and Concept of Limitation]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1972.

Spae, Joseph J. "Postscript as an Answer." Japan Missionary Bulletin. vol. 16, no. 8 (October 1962): pp. 507-509.

————. "Sōkagakkai." Japan Missionary Bulletin. vol. 14, no. 7 (August-September 1960): pp. 454-457.

Straelen, H van. "The Japanese New Religions." Numen. vol. 9, no. 3 (November 1962): pp. 228-240.

Suzuki, Norihisa. Uchimura Kanzō to Sono Jidai, Shiga Shigetaka tono Hikaku [Uchimura Kanzō and His Age, in Comparison with Shiga Shigetaka]. Tokyo: Nihon Kirisutokyō-dan Shuppan-kyoku, 1975.

Takagi, Hiroo. Nihon no Shinkō Shūkyō [New Religions in Japan]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970.

Takagi, Yutaka. Nichiren: Sono Kōdō to Shisō [Nichiren: His Behavior and Thought]. Tokyo: Hyōron-sha, 1970.

————. Nichiren to Sono Montei [Nichiren and His Followers]. Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1973.

Tamaru, Tokuzen; Muraoka, Kū; and Miyata, Noboru, ed. Kindai Nihon Shūkyō-shi Shiryō [Source Book of History of Religions of Modern Japan]. Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppan-sha, 1973.

Tamura, Yoshirō. "Nichiren ni okeru Rekishi-teki Jisshō no Seishin" [Historical, Positivistic Mind of Nichiren]. Nihon Rekishi. vol. 18 (August 1949): pp. 61-68.

Thomsen, Harry. The New Religions of Japan. Tokyo and Rutland, Vermont: Charles E. Tattle Co., 1963.

The Threefold Lotus Sutra. Translated by Katō Bunnō; Tamaru Yoshirō; and Miyasaka Kōjirō. Revised by W. E. Soothill; Wilhelm Schiffer; and Pier P. Del Compana. New York: Weatherhill; and Tokyo: Kōsei, 1975.

Toda Jōsei (Myō, Gokū). Ningen Kakumei [Human Revolution]. 2 vols. Tokyo: Seibun-kan, 1957.

————. Toda Jōsei Zenshū [Collection of Toda Josei's Works]. 5 vols. Tokyo: Wakō-sha, 1965-1966.

————. Wakaki Hi no Shuki: Gokuchū-ki [Note of My Young Days: Letters from the Prison]. Tokyo: Seiga Shobō, 1971.

Tōhata, Seiichi. "Nōsei Gakusha to shite no Yanagita Kunio" [Yanagita Kunio, as a Scholar of Agricultural Policy]. Bungaku. vol. 29, no. 1 (January 1961), pp. 40-47.

Tokoro, Shigemoto. Kindai Nihon no Shūkyō to Nashionarizumu [Religion and Nationalism in Modern Japan]. Tokyo: Fūzanbō, 1966.

————. Kindai Shakai to Nichiren Shugi [Japan's Modern Society and Nichirenism]. Tokyo: Hyōron-sha, 1972.

————. Nichiren no Shisō to Kamakura Bukkyō [Nichiren's Thought and Kamakura Buddhism]. Tokyo: Fūzanbō, 1966.

————. Nichiren to Iu Hito [The Man Called Nichiren]. Tokyo: Shisei-dō, 1971.

————, and Takagi, Yutaka, ed. Nichiren. Nihon Shisō Taikei [Collection of Thoughts of Japan], vol. 14. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1974.

Tokyo Daigaku Hokekyō Kenkyū-kai, ed. Nichiren Shōshū Sōka Gakkai. Tokyo: Sankibō Butshorin, 1962.

————, ed. Sōka Gakkai no Rinen to Jissen [Idea and Practice of Sōka Gakkai]. Tokyo: Daisan Bunmei-sha, 1975.

Tokyo Daigaku Shakai-gakka, and Tokyo Joshi Daigaku Shakai-gakka. Sōka Gakkai: Gendai Nihon ni okeru Taishū Soshiki to Taishū Undō [Sōka Gakkai: Peoples' Organization and Peoples' Movement of Today's Japan]. Tokyo: Chūō Kappan-sha, 1963.

Tsuji, Takeyoshi. "Makiguchi Tsunesaburō to Sōka Kyōikugaku-setsu" [Makiguchi Tsunesaburō and Value-creating Educational Theory]. Tōyō Gakujutsu Kenkyū. vol. 6, no. 9 (Winter 1968): pp. 1-9.

Tsunazawa, Mitsuaki. Kindai Nihon no Dochaku Shisō: Nōhon-shugi no Kenkyū [Indigenous Thought of Modern Japan: Study of Physiocracy]. Nagoya: Fūbai-sha, 1969.

Tsurumi, Kazuko. "Shakai Hendō no Paradaimu: Yanagita Kunio no Shigoto o Jiku to shite" [A Paradigm of Social Change: The Work of Yanagita Kunio as an Axis], in Shisō no Bōken [Adventure of Thought]. pp. 145-186. Edited by Tsurumi Kazuko, and Ichikawa Saburō. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1974.

————. "Yanagita Kunio's Work as a Model of Endogenous Development." Japan Quarterly, vol. 21, no. 3 (July-September 1975): pp. 223-238.

Tsurumi, Shunsuke; Mori, Hideto; Yanagita, Kunio; and Shimane, Kiyoshi. Shakubuku [Forced Conversion]. Tokyo: Sanpō, 1963.

Uchimura, Kanzō. "Chijin-ron" [Study of Land and Man]. In Uchimura Kanzō Shinkō Chosaku-shū [Collection of the Writings of Uchimura Kanzō on Faith]. vol. 4, pp. 5-106. Edited by Yamamoto Taijirō. Tokyo: Kyōbunkan, 1963.

————. How I became a Christian. Tokyo: Keisei-sha, 1895.

————. Shokan [Letters]. Uchimura Kanzō Zenshū [Collection of Uchimura Kanzō's Works], vol. 20. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1932.

Uefuji, Kazuyuki, and Oono Yasuo, ed. Kakumei no Taiga: Sōka Gakkai 45-nen-shi [A Large River of Revolution: History of Sōka Gakkai from 1930 to 1975]. Tokyo: Seikyō Shinbun-sha, 1976.

Uemura, Sanai. Kore ga Sōka Gakkai da: Moto Gakkai Kanbu tachi no Kokuhaku [This is the Sōka Gakkai: Confessions of Former Leading Members of Sōka Gakkai]. Tokyo: Ayumi Shuppan-sha, 1970.

Umehara, Takeshi. "Sōka Gakkai no Tetsugaku-teki Shūkyō-teki Hihan" [Philosophical and Religious Criticism of Sōka Gakkai]. Shisō no Kagaku. no. 33 (December 1964): pp. 83-95.

The Union of New Religious Organizations of Japan. "Reminiscences of Religion in Postwar Japan." Contemporary Religions in Japan. vol. 6, no. 2 (June 1965): pp. 111-263;

vol. 6, no. 3 (September 1965): pp. 295-314; vol. 6, no. 4 (December 1965): pp. 382-402; vol. 7, no. 1 (March 1966): pp. 51-79; vol. 7, no. 2 (June 1966): pp. 166-187; and vol. 7, no. 3 (September 1966): pp. 217-273.

Ward, Lester F. Applied Sociology. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1906.

Watanabe, Baiyū. "Modern Japanese Religion; Their Success Explained." Monumenta Nipponica. vol. 13, nos. 1-2 (April-July 1957): pp. 153-162.

White, James W. The Sokagakkai and Mass Society. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1970.

Windelband, Wilhelm. An Introduction to Philosophy. Translated by Joseph McCabe. London: T. Fisher Unwin Ltd., 1921.

Yajima, Shūkaku. "Hokekyō ka Marukusu-shugi ka" [The Lotus Sutra or Marxism?]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō, pp. 475-478. Edited by Misaka Fusahiro.

Yamamoto, Nobuyoshi, and Konno, Toshihiko. Kindai Kyōiku no Tennōsei Ideorogi [Emperor-system Ideology in the Education of Modern Japan]. Tokyo: Shinsen-sha, 1973.

Yamauchi, Tokuryū. "Kachiron o Yomite: Nisan no Gimon ni tsuite" [My Reflection on Philosophy of Value: about a Few Questions]. Chūgai Nippō, 12 February 1957, p. 1.

Yanagita, Kunio. "Asahi Shinbun Ronsetsu" [Editorials of the Asahi]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū [Collection of Yanagita Kunio's Works]. vol. 32 and vol. 33. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1963 and 1964.

————. "Daijōsai ni kansuru Shokan" [My Opinion on Daijōsai]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 31, pp. 376-381. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1964.

————. "Ethnology towa Nani ka?" [What is Ethnology?]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 25, pp. 232-247. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1964.

————. "Fukō naru Geijutsu" [Unfortunate Art]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 7, pp. 235-260. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1962.

————. "Hikaku Minzokugaku no Mondai" [Problems of Comparative Study of Folklore]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 30, pp. 63-72. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1964.

————. "Ipusen Zakkan" [My Impressions on Ibsen]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 31, pp. 343-348.

———. "Jidai to Nōsei" [Age and Agricultural Policy]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 16, pp. 1-160. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1962.

———. "Jo" [Introduction to Makiguchi's Value-creating Educational System]. In Makiguchi Tsunesaburō Zenshū. vol. 1, pp. 399-400.

———. "Kokyō 70-nen" [Seventy Years since I Left My Home]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 34, pp. 1-422. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1964.

———. "Kokyō 70-nen Shūi" [Gleanings from "Seventy Years since I Left My Home"]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 34, pp. 424-505.

———. "Kyōdo Kenkyū towa Nani ka" [What is the Study of Places of Origin?]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 25, pp. 263-269.

———. "Minkan Denshō-ron" [Popular Tradition]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 25, pp. 329-358.

———. "Nihon Nōmin-shi" [History of Japanese Farmers]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 16, pp. 161-236.

———. "Nihon no Minzokugaku" [Study of Japanese Folklore]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 25, pp. 248-259.

———. "Nōgyō Seisakugaku" [Study of Agricultural Policy]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 28, pp. 287-421. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1964.

———. "Nōseigaku" [Study of Agricultural Policy]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 28, pp. 187-285.

———. "Sangyō Kumiai Shikin Yūzū-sho no Hanashi" [About Circulating Media of Industrial Union]. In Yanagita Kunio Nōsei Ronshū, pp. 70-99. Edited by Fujii Takashi.

———. "Sanjin Kō" [Study of Mountain People]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 4, pp. 172-188. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1963.

———. "Senzo no Hanashi" [About Our Ancestors]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 10, pp. 1-152. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1962.

———. "Shintō Shiken" [My Understanding of Shintoism]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 10, pp. 431-459.

———. "Shintō to Minzokugaku" [Shintoism and Study of Folklore]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 10, pp. 315-396.

———. "Sho Gaikoku no Minzoku Kenkyū" [Studies of Folklore in Foreign Countries]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 25, pp. 292-300.

———. "Tamashii no Yukue" [Where Does a Dead Soul Go?]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 15, pp. 553-561. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1963.

———. "Waga Kuni Kyōdo Kenkyū no Enkaku" [History of the Study of Places of Origin in Japan]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 25, pp. 301-313.

———. "Watakushi no Tetsugaku: Mura no Shinkō" [My Philosophy: Faith of Villages]. Dentō to Gendai. no. 34 (July 1975): pp. 145-167.

———. "Yamamiya Kō" [Study of Mountain Shrine]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 11, pp. 295-358. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1963.

———. "Yama no Jinsei" [Life in Mountains]. In Teihon, Yanagita Kunio Shū. vol. 4, pp. 59-171.